

- Numberger, K.*, Inhalt und Metrum in der Lyrik des Horaz. Diss. München 1959 (71-73 14. Kapitel: Die Anordnung einiger Horazoden innerhalb der Odensammlung und das Verhältnis von Inhalt und Form bei ihnen)
- Collinge, N.E.*, The structure of Horace's odes, London 1961 (36-55 The order of the odes)
- Salat, P.*, La composition du livre I des odes d'Horace, *Latomus* 28, 1969, 554-574
- Nisbet, R.G.M./Hubbard, M.*, A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1, Oxford 1970 (XXIII f.)
- Giardina, G.*, Sulla struttura delle odi di Orazio, *Lingua e Stile*, 5, 1970, 45-55

---

## HEINSIUS'S MANUSCRIPTS OF OVID

No editor of Ovid has contributed as much as Nicolaus Heinsius to the understanding and improvement of the text, and none has devoted as much effort to collating manuscripts. In his edition, however, he is notoriously vague about the source of many readings. That this vagueness is not due to carelessness was first appreciated by Merkel, who discovered some of his material in Berlin; but unfortunately Merkel's edition of *Tristia* (Berlin 1837), in which he explains the nature of this material (pp. V-XLII), seems to be a rare book, and knowledge of Heinsius's collations spread slowly even after W. M. Lindsay had made it known that more could be inspected in the Bodleian<sup>1</sup>). The only scholar who has taken full advantage of them is E. H. Alton, who in the course of working on the tradition of *Fasti* succeeded in identifying all but three of Heinsius's manuscripts<sup>2</sup>). D. A. Slater in his *Apparatus Criticus* to *Metamorphoses* (Oxford 1927) published a list of Heinsius's manuscripts from the material in the Bodleian and reported readings from some of them (pp. 22-35), but he could have identified more than he did. Only in the last 25 years have full lists of Heinsius's manuscripts been published, from the material in the Bodleian by F. Munari, *S.I.F.C.* xxiv (1950) 161-5

---

1) *C.R.* xii (1898) 446 and more fully in *Centralblatt für Bibl.* xviii (1901) 159-63.

2) See D. E. W. Wormell, *Hermathena* xciii (1959) 38-62.

and xxix (1957) 98–114<sup>3</sup>), and from the material in Berlin by H. Boese, *Philologus* cvi (1962) 155–73. Both Munari and Boese have been able to make a number of identifications, and others were made by F. W. Lenz<sup>4</sup>), who seems never to have consulted the collations. In spite of this progress, editions of Ovid are still appearing in which extant manuscripts are cited on the authority of Burman<sup>5</sup>) or even twice over<sup>6</sup>), and it is still easy to form the impression that Heinsius had access to many manuscripts since lost. The object of the present article is to remedy this state of affairs so far as possible by identifying some of the unidentified manuscripts and making available a selection of readings that may facilitate the identification of others<sup>7</sup>).

3) Munari's list is not quite complete: *Heroides* 15, *Amores* 3.5, *Consolatio ad Liviam*, and *Halieuticon*, are added in the present article.

4) *Eranos* li (1953) 66–88.

5) Heinsius did not abandon Ovid after his annotated edition was published in 1661, but his later material first appeared in Burman's edition (Amsterdam 1727). On the dangers of trusting Burman see Merkel, *op. cit.* XI–XIV.

6) In Luck's edition of *Tristia* (Heidelberg 1967), Paris. Lat. 8239 is cited both as E and as ‚cod. Gallicus Heinsii‘, and Paris. Genov. Y 1 3 (2408) both as C and as ‚cod. Richelianus ap. Heins.‘, even if neither appears in both guises at once as Leid. Voss. O 51 does in Magnus's edition of *Metamorphoses* (Berlin 1914) at 15. 546.

7) Besides the Bodleian and the British Museum, I visited to this end, with the help of a generous grant from the Craven Committee, the following libraries: the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, five libraries in Padua, the Marciana, the Ambrosiana, the Bibliothèque Municipale in Dijon, and the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes in Paris. To librarians in all of these I am grateful for their assistance, but especially to Dr. Ursula Winter of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, who placed the material in the Diez collection freely at my disposal and subsequently, answered several inquiries, and to Dr. R. W. Hunt and Miss A. C. de la Mare of the Bodleian, who gave palaeographical and bibliographical advice.

Most of the identifications, however, were made in Oxford, and thanks are due to the librarians who were kind enough to confirm them by checking readings or answering inquiries: Dr. I. C. Cunningham of the National Library of Scotland; Dr. Åke Davidsson of the University library, Uppsala; Dr. W. Milde of the Herzog-August Bibliothek, Wolfenbüttel; Dr. M.-P. Laffitte of the Bibliothèque Nationale; Dr. Giorgio E. Ferrari of the Marciana; Dr. B. Maracchi of the Laurenziana; Dr. Maria Cristofari of the Biblioteca Bertoliana, Vicenza; Dr. P. F. J. Obbema of the Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, Leyden; Dr. O. Mazal of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek; Dr. L. Voet of the Museum Plantin-Moretus, Antwerpen; Dr. Tue Gad of the Royal Library, Copenhagen; Dr. M. Steinmann of the Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität, Basel; Dr. M. Witteck of the Bibliothèque Royale, Brussels; Dr. P. Zahn of the Stadtbibliothek,

Identifications have been made partly by a comparison of readings, whether directly or through some modern edition, and partly by a comparison of contents or ownership, which is permitted by most library catalogues. The grounds for an identification are given in brief<sup>8</sup>). Readings have been selected from the unidentified manuscripts in accordance with two principles: the wilder the better, so as to rule out coincidence, and the easier to find the better, since it is no pleasure turning up *Met.* 9. 487 in any but the most elegant of manuscripts. For convenience of identification the readings are given continuously under each work rather than separately under each manuscript, unless it is distinctively fragmentary.

Early editions used by Heinsius are ignored except in the list of his sources for *Consolatio ad Liviam*, which is being published for the first time. Where the same collation exists in more than one version, the later or latest is listed for the sake of compactness, since the earlier ones are widely scattered. If manuscripts are ignored for which only a tentative identification has hitherto been suggested, it is implied that no other has much chance of being right. Identifications made already but not given in the articles of Munari and Boese are mentioned in the first footnote on each work.

The order of presentation is chronological to the extent allowed by the collations themselves<sup>9</sup>). Symbols like C<sup>7</sup> and F<sup>68</sup> stand for C in Bodl. Auct. S 5 7 and F in Berol. Diez 4<sup>0</sup> 1068.

---

Nürnberg; Dr. W. Werner of the Universitätsbibliothek, Heidelberg; Father F. Andreu of S. Andrea della Valle, Rome; and an anonymous librarian at the Vatican. I am also obliged to Mr. W. S. Barrett for confirming an identification in the British Museum and to Dr. N. J. Richardson for inspecting several Farnesiani in Naples.

8) Where an identification rests on common readings, specifying them seemed a waste of space, since they cannot be checked except in Berlin or Oxford and then only up to a point.

9) Collations made before Heinsius first went abroad are entered mainly in Berol. Diez 4<sup>0</sup> 1074 + 1069 + 1073, from which most of them were later transferred to other volumes. The dates of the collations made abroad are as follows:

(a) of the elegiac works

1641 (England): Diez 4<sup>0</sup> 1068 + 1076

1644 (Belgium): Diez B 148 e, Bodl. Auct. S 5 2

1645-6 (Paris): Diez 4<sup>0</sup> 1071 + 1070

1646-8, 1650 (Italy, Copenhagen): Auct. S 5 10 + 12

1651-3 (Paris, Italy, Basel, Strasburg): Auct. S 5 7 + 9

(b) of *Metamorphoses*

1641 (England): Diez 4<sup>0</sup> 1072

*Heroides*<sup>10)</sup>

Diez 4° 1068

- E. codex V.C.Petri Scriverii, omnium vetustissimus, quos vidi [adscr. recentior est], ante annos quadringentos litera exigua scriptus [adscr. tamen notae non optimae]<sup>11)</sup>
- G. codex Palatinus membranaceus a Jano Gebhardo collatus, qui non vetustus fuisse videtur = Vat. Pal. 1668
- H. alter Palatinus chartaceus ab eodem Gebhardo collatus = Vat. Pal. 1707<sup>12)</sup>

1644 (Belgium): Diez B 148 e

1645-6 (Paris): Diez 4° 1075

1646-7 (Italy): Auct. S 5 11

1646-8? (Italy): Auct. ii R 6 25

1652-3 (Italy, Switzerland, Strasburg): Auct. S 5 8

1653 (Strasburg): Auct. S 5 5

Manuscripts made available to Heinsius after his return from Italy in 1653 are mostly collated in the latest of these volumes, except that a fresh volume, Auct. ii R 6 23, was used for *Metamorphoses*. The evidence for these dates is Heinsius's correspondence with Gronovius and Vossius, most easily consulted in Burman's *Sylloge Epistularum* (Leyden 1727), vol. III. If the Hamburgensis of *Tristia* and the Helmaestadiensis of various elegiac works were collated by Heinsius himself on the spot, the former collation was made on his return from Sweden in 1655 (cf. *Syll.* III 346 and Merkel, *op. cit.* VII), the latter on his way to Sweden in 1661 (*Syll.* III 454).

The collation of the Urbinas in Auct. S 5 5, which is not in Heinsius's hand, is expressly attributed to Langermann when he reproduces it in Diez 4° 1075 (*Syll.* III 314 shows that it was made early in 1653), and the same hand is responsible not only for the fragmentum Caesenas in the same volume but also for the two Menteliani of *Metamorphoses* (C<sup>8</sup> and D<sup>8</sup>), the Combianus (B<sup>7</sup> of *Nux* etc.), and, except in *Med.*, the unidentified codex Mediolani emptus (A<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides* 15 etc.).

10) References are to Dörrie's edition (Berlin 1971), which includes some of the ill-attested couplets in the numeration.

J<sup>7</sup> and K<sup>7</sup> were identified by Dörrie, *Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Epistulae Heroidum* (*Nachr. Gött.* 1960) II 408, 401, with Laur. Stroz. 122 and Basil. F iv 17. N<sup>10</sup>, the chartaceus Acad. Helmaestadiensis of various elegiac works, was accidentally identified by Dörrie, *ib.* 403, with Guelf. Helm. 336. So far from being 'gut begründet' by Lenz, *Eranos* lv (1957) 27-8, the identification is not even mentioned by him; indeed, he was probably unaware that Heinsius had used a Helmaestadiensis.

11) The manuscript breaks off at 20. 98 *redde deae*. Distinctive readings include 2. 71 *falsique*, 3. 113 *te flere*, 4. 39 *cornu*, 7. 23 *ficta*, 48 *vitas*.

12) Gebhardus's description of G (Munari, *op. cit.* 113) puts the identification beyond doubt. H contains 16. 39-144; cf. Giomini, *Riv. di Cult. Class.* vii (1965) 511-29.

## Diez 4° 1071

- C. codex Regius in charta scriptus = Paris. Lat. 8243 (readings)<sup>13)</sup>  
 E. codex Gronovianus ante 400 annos scriptus = Leid. Bibl. Publ. 163 (catalogue<sup>14)</sup>)  
 G. codex meus chartaceus = Diez B Sant. 8 (readings)  
 H. codex membraneus 500 circiter annorum Societatis Jesu Lovaniensis = Bruxell. 21368<sup>15)</sup>  
 I. codex chartaceus anno MCCCCLI scriptus eiusdem Societatis = Bruxell. 4429 (catalogue<sup>16)</sup>)  
 L. alter membraneus eiusdem Moreti = Antwerp. Plant. 141 (readings)

## Auct. S 5 10

- A. B. C. D. E. codd. Medicei sunt recentioris notae = Laur. 36. 2, 36. 28, 36. 27, 36. 30, 36. 29<sup>17)</sup>  
 G. cod. S. Johan. in Viridario Patavin. 400 annorum<sup>18)</sup>

13) Boese should not have suggested 7995, which is *membraneus*. He may have been led astray by Dörrie, *op. cit.* (n. 10) 407.

14) *Bibliotheca Universitatis Leidensis: codices manuscripti* III (Leyden 1912) p. 84. A collation of the manuscript was published by L. A. J. Burgersdijk, *De tribus Ovidii Heroïdum codicibus Leidensibus* (Utrecht diss., Leyden 1899) 56-240.

15) The history of this identification starts from Heinsius's notoriously false assertion on 17. 1-2 *si mihi ... probae* that 'Puteaneus margini adscriptos habet hos versus initio epistulae'. No-one could trace these lines until Dörrie said he had found them in two English manuscripts, one at Eton and the other in the Bodleian (*Untersuchungen* I 210); and when Dörrie came to publish his edition, not even he could trace them any more. Having confirmed their absence from the two English manuscripts and also from the collations in the Bodleian, I suggested to Professor O. Zwierlein that the collations in Berlin might reveal their source. They did, when he had realized the nature of Heinsius's mistake: see his lucid exposition in *Rh. Mus.* cxvi (1973) 275-9. From the readings that he noted it appeared to both of us that the source bore a strong resemblance to Dörrie's Bx, Bruxellensis 21368, with which indeed Dörrie himself (on 17. 129) had thought of identifying it; and Dr. Wittek confirmed that Bx has 17. 1-2 in the margin. When Heinsius collated it, it did not lack 20. 142-230.

16) P. Thomas, *Catalogue des Manuscrits de Classiques Latins de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles* (Gand 1896) no. 32.

17) A. C. E. can be identified from vol. II of Bandini's catalogue (Florence 1775), which also states that 36. 28 and 36. 30 were used by Heinsius. A few readings established which of these two manuscripts is which.

18) G is absent from the handwritten catalogue of this library drawn up in 1760, Ven. Marc. It. XI 323 (7107). A close relative is Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 10, which shares with it such readings as 7. 155 *avida belli est*, 9. 53 *fertur*, 11. 124 *ossa*, 14. 46 *cecidit*, 16. 161 *foret* (all hopelessly unmetrical), 5. 25

- H. cod. Franciscanorum Patavin. eiusdem aetatis, sed mendosus  
 I. cod. Ambrosian. eiusdem aetatis, 500 ann. = I 8 inf. (readings<sup>19</sup>)  
 L. codex bibl. Hafniensis 500 annorum = codex Bibl. Univ. Hafniensis anno 1728 incendio absumptus<sup>20</sup>)  
 M. Arondelianus chartaceus = Edinburg. Bibl. Nat. (quondam Bibl. Advocat.) 18. 2. 9<sup>21</sup>)

*conscia*, 7. 45 *quod tu mediteris*, 8. 79 *fixa*, 18. 180 *clamas* (for *lacrimas*), 19. 44 *lampade iam pingui tingere*, 139 *ereptus*, 20. 157 *verbula pacti*, 242 *rapta* (for *in eo*); in several places a reading shared with G has been altered by a later hand, e.g. 7. 71 *quicquid erit*<sup>1</sup>, *quicquid id est*<sup>2</sup>, 85 *at socii me movere*<sup>1</sup>, *at munera me movere*<sup>2</sup>, 124 *ad*<sup>1</sup>, *et*<sup>2</sup>, 10. 29 *unde*<sup>1</sup>, *inde*<sup>2</sup>, 63 *secundos*<sup>1</sup> (?) erased, 11. 122 *sed*<sup>1</sup>, *nec*<sup>2</sup>, 17. 47 *falso*<sup>1</sup>, *falsa*<sup>2</sup>, 18. 135 *iterate*<sup>1</sup>, *iterare*<sup>2</sup>. One reading above all that Heinsius might have taken from this manuscript is the strange cross between *iam* and *tam* that he records from G at 7. 54. Identity seems to be precluded, however, by the occasional disagreement, e.g. 1. 19 *Trith-Can.*, *Tlep-G.* 2. 35 *et auris Can.*, *iniquis G.*, 3. 88 *et preme Can.*, *comprime G.*, 105 *animas Can.*, *animos G.*, 5. 11 *vero Can.*, *veri G.*, 8. 81 *nam Can.*, *iam G.*, 18. 68 *cadit Can.*, *cadat G.* At 6. 31, where editors accept or should accept *ut rediit animus* from G, Can. has the same reading by the first hand, but a later hand has added *que* to *ut* and perhaps cancelled the second *i* of *rediit*. Another manuscript in the Bodleian that reads *ut rediit animus* is Lat. Class. d 8 (S.C. 31665).

19) Dörrie's description of this manuscript (ed. p. 15) is inaccurate. The later hand has added not 1. 37-70 but 1. 1-70, and also at the end 20. 209-21. 14. Where Dörrie and Heinsius disagree, Heinsius is almost invariably right, e.g. in *Ep.* 6 alone 7 *quo licet* cod. et Heins., *quamlibet* Dörrie, 85 *curru* cod. et Heins., *cursu* Dörrie, 157 *relicta* cod. et Heins., *relinquat* Dörrie, who denies in *op. cit.* (n. 10) 399 n. 1 that *relicta* is to be found in any Ambrosianus.

Heinsius also consulted E 84 sup., from which he noted e.g. 6. 28 *vocant* and 14. 83 *pedibus*, and O 138 inf., which is the other Ambrosianus besides I 8 inf. that has four spurious couplets after 21. 14.

20) This information comes from Dr. Gad, who writes as follows: 'In the 17th century the term [Hafniensis] may indicate a ms. in the Royal Library, but more probably a ms. in the then more important University Library. However, that library was burned down in the great fire of Copenhagen 1728'. He points out that E. C. Werlauff had drawn a similar conclusion in his *Historiske Efterretninger om det store kongelige Bibliothek i Kiøbenhavn* (1844) 163 n. i., with regard to the Hafniensis of *Tristia* and the two Hafnienses of *Ex Ponto*. Among the six manuscripts of Ovid that Dr. Gad has found in S. Birket Smith, *Om Kjøbenhavns Universitetsbibliothek for 1728, især dets Håndskriftsamlinger* (1882), are two that look like Heinsius's Hafnienses: 'Ovidius in membrana' (p. 160) = L<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides* etc., and 'Ovidius de Ponto' (p. 93) = F<sup>12</sup> of *Ex Ponto*.

In Heinsius's opinion, though perhaps in Vossius's words, the Royal Library at the time contained only 'pulverem et sordes' (*Syll.* III 587).

21) The identification of this manuscript, declared an urgent necessity by Lenz, *op. cit.* (n. 4) 75 no. 5, eluded the two recent editors of *Amores*,

Auct. S 5 7

D. Farnesianus 400 annorum = Neapol. Bibl. Nat. IV F 15  
(readings)

F. alter (sc. Farn.) chartaceus = Diez B Sant. 29 (readings)

not surprisingly, since it does not appear in any catalogue of Arundel manuscripts.

Thomas Earl of Arundel died at Padua in 1646, and his manuscripts were given by Henry Howard in 1678 partly to the College of Arms but mostly to the Royal Society. The former were catalogued in *Catalogi Librorum Manuscriptorum Angliae et Hiberniae* (Oxford 1697) II i 177-8 and again in a printed but unpublished *Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts in the Library of the College of Arms* drawn up in 1829 by W.H. Black (the Bodleian wrongly ascribes its copy to C.G. Young, who was York Herald and presented it); the latter were catalogued by W.Perry in *Bibliotheca Norfolkiana* (London 1681) 126-53 (reprinted in the catalogue of 1697, II i 74-83) and again when they were transferred to the British Museum in 1831 (1840). In his introduction, which is the best source of information about the Arundel library, Black speaks of losses between 1646 and 1678.

A combination of reason and accident led me to the suspicion that the Arondelianus might be Advocates' ms. 18. 2. 9 in the National Library of Scotland, and a full description of this manuscript very kindly furnished by Dr. Cunningham put the identification beyond doubt. Dr. Cunningham will be publishing his description in *Scriptorium*, and it will entirely supersede Schenkl's brief and inaccurate description in *Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum*, no. 2993. For present purposes one antiquarian and one textual fact must suffice: the manuscript was bought by the Advocates' Library in 1721 from a bookseller in Edinburgh; and its text of 21. 15-146, which is in a 16th-century hand, derives in all probability from the ed. Veneta of 1474.

Thomas Earl of Arundel acquired the manuscript in 1636 when he bought the Pirkheimer library at Nürnberg: see the *Dictionary of National Biography* X p. 76. It had been collated in 1632 by Gronovius (cf. Merkel's ed. of *Tristia* p. XXXVI), and in 1637 he supplied Heinsius with collations of *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* (*Syll.* III 19). These collations, which are preserved in Diez 8<sup>o</sup> 2586, are the source of CP<sup>73</sup>. In 1639 Gronovius wrote to Heinsius from London as follows: 'Pirkheimeri codicem saepiuscule a Fr. Junio poposci, sed negavit inveniri. Nec verbis eius indubito propter summam comitatem, qua omnibus, quae vellem, Arondellianae bibliothecae uti me facillime permisit' (*Syll.* III 82). Heinsius himself, when he visited England in 1641, collated an Arondelianus of *Fasti* (A<sup>76</sup>) and briefly inspected another of *Met.* (c<sup>72</sup>). The Pirkheimerianus seems finally to have been put at his disposal, no doubt by Junius (cf. *Syll.* III 411), during 1658-60. It must have remained in his possession, because it went up for auction in 1682 with the rest of his library (*Bibliotheca Heinsiana* II p. 68 no. 94). One copy of *Bibliotheca Heinsiana* in the Bodleian has annotations by a buyer, no doubt Ed. Bernard, from whom many of Heinsius's manuscripts came to the Bodleian; and it looks as though he had bought the Pirkheimerianus. It may be 'Ovidii amores, et Epistolae' in the catalogue of 1697, II p. 227 no. 99; certainly no other manuscript of Bernard's in the Bodleian answers better to the description, vague as it is.

- a. fragmentum Farnesianum ultimarum epistularum, 500 annorum<sup>22)</sup>  
 H. codex meus a Medonio mihi donatus 400 ann. = Bodl. Rawl. G 100 S. C. 14826 (readings)<sup>23)</sup>  
 M.<sup>24)</sup> cod. 300 annorum, quem habui a Vossio  
 N. alius Vossii codex 400 annorum = Diez B Sant. 7 (readings)  
 O. alius eiusdem chartaceus = Bodl. Auct. F 2 17 S. C. 8873 (readings)

1. 8 *lentos* M, 2. 39 *bella* H, 84 *remigium* (for *armiferam*) M, 4. 11 *iussit amor* G, 5. 20 *duxi* M, 39 *anumque* H, 56 *quamque licet* H, 61 *ignata* M, 74 *tecta* M, 6. 8 *favente* M, 31 *ut rediit animus* G, 10. 7 *cana* (for *terra*) H, 25 *densi* M, 29 *unde ... sum nunc* G, 57 *descendimus* H, 63 *secundos* G, 11. 65 *vix* (for *tamen*) G

*Heroides* 15

Diez 4° 1074

Usi etiam sumus cod. chartaceo huius epistolae, quem Gronovii nostri beneficio habuimus, CG = F<sup>68</sup>

Diez 4° 1068

F. codex chartaceus quondam Abrahami Merani = Wratislav. Magd. 1385<sup>25)</sup>

Diez 4° 1071

A. codex Regiae bibliothecae coniunctus cum reliquis Epistolis chartaceus = C<sup>71</sup> of *Heroides*<sup>26)</sup>

22) This fragment is cited from 18. 90 to 20. 178. Distinctive readings include 18. 98 *ego* (for *enim*), 19. 7 *tenerum*, 20. 81 *anguror*.

23) Heinsius received the Medoniani in 1652 (*Syll.* V 614–8).

24) A complication about M is that 'M littera notata per totum codicem excerpta sunt ex Ovidii editione Parmensi 1489 manu Mathaei Herculani emendata'; but in many places this M has been augmented to MH. or MHerc. or MHercul., and in any case the inks are distinguishable.

25) The readings of F fit this manuscript, which is Dörrie's no. 96, and Heinsius's statement in Diez B 148e f. 135r, 'commodavit praeterea Gronovius noster chartaceum alterum in quo cum Juvenale descriptus erat' fits the description of it in K. Ziegler, *Catalogus Codicum Latinorum Classicorum qui in Bibliotheca Urbica Wratislaviensi adservantur* (Wratislawa 1915).

26) In spite of Heinsius's description, Dörrie identifies this Regius with 7989, which does not contain the other *Heroides* (ed. p. 307). He shows no knowledge of 8243.

## Auct. S 5 10

- A. B. C. D. E. codices sunt Medicej, recentioris omnes notae =  
 Laur. 36. 2, 36. 23, 34. 26, 36. 21, 39. 25<sup>27)</sup>  
 F. S. Johannis in Viridario Patavii = Ven. Marc. Lat. Z 445<sup>28)</sup>  
 G. codex Arundelianus chartaceus = M<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*

## Auct. S 5 7

- A. codex meus chartaceus Mediolani emptus, in quo et Amores  
 B. Vaticanus no. 1595  
 C. Farnes. chart. = F<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides*  
 D. codex Reginae chartaceus, quem a Georgio Turriano<sup>29)</sup>  
 accepit = Bodl. d'Orville 162/S.C. 17040 (readings)

---

27) For these manuscripts de Vries's edition (Leyden 1885) is of more service than Dörrie's, but like Dörrie he ignores 36. 2, perhaps because the index to Bandini's catalogue does not include it among manuscripts that contain *Heroides* 15. That it is Heinsius's A has been confirmed by Dr. Maracchi.

Other manuscripts of *Heroides* 15 ignored by Dörrie are Mus. Brit. Harl. 2555, 2599, 2695, and 3716, Holkham Hall 369, and Paris. Lat. 8243 (cf. the previous note).

28) F might at first sight appear to be G of *Heroides*, but it creates a problem in relation to another Paduan manuscript, D<sup>10</sup> of *A. A.*, 'cod. chartaceus S. Antonii Patavii cui et Remedium Amoris et Sapphus epistula et Nux et Medicamen Faciei accedit'. This manuscript is not cited for either *Heroides* 15 or *Rem.*; but like F of *Heroides* 15, C<sup>10</sup> of *Rem.* is 'Codex S. Johannis in Viridario Patavii in charta scriptus'. Furthermore, Tomasini in his catalogue of the Paduan libraries (1639) mentions only two relevant manuscripts, 'Heroides Ovidii' in the library S. Johannis in Viridario (p. 25) and 'Ovidius de Arte Amandi' in the library S. Antonii (p. 53). It therefore seems simplest to suppose that only two manuscripts are in question, a manuscript S. Johannis in Viridario containing *Heroides* alone without 15 (G<sup>10</sup>) and a manuscript S. Antonii containing, as Heinsius says, *A. A.* (D<sup>10</sup>), *Rem.* (C<sup>10</sup>), *Heroides* 15 (F<sup>10</sup>), *Nux* (D<sup>10</sup>), and *Med.* (C<sup>10</sup>). One sign that Heinsius was in some confusion over Paduan manuscripts is that he gives two incompatible designations for D<sup>10</sup> of *Nux*, 'cod. chart. Patav. Eremit.' and 'cod. S. Antonii Patavii in charta'.

Fortunately it is possible to go further than supposition. At lines 7 and 33a-4a readings that occur in Heinsius's F are cited by Dörrie from his no. 138, and this manuscript, Ven. Marc. Lat. Z 445, contains precisely what the manuscript S. Antonii contained (see also under *Amores* 3. 5). It was bequeathed to the Marciana by Jo. Bapt. Recanati, who died in 1735: see Zanetti, *Latina et Italica D. Marci Bibliotheca* (1741) p. 177, and *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* XXX (Leipzig 1741) col. 1266. Dr. Ferrari has checked a number of readings and also points out that according to a subscription on f. 66r the manuscript was written 'in agro Patavino'.

29) For Georgius Turrianus see Munari p. 102 n. 1.

O. codex chartaceus, quem a Vossio accepi = O<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides*<sup>30</sup>)  
 P. codex quem a Langermanno accepi = Bodl. Auct. F 1 18/  
 S.C. 8857<sup>31</sup>)

19 *carmine*, 41 *tibi iam*, 73 *sparsi collo*, 186 *usque*

*Amores*<sup>32</sup>)

Diez 4° 1068

B. codex Scriverianus chartaceus = Guelf. Extrav. 264. 12<sup>33</sup>)

Diez 4° 1071

F. alter eiusdem (sc. Moreti) codex = Mus. Brit. Add. 11975  
 (readings)

G. tertius eiusdem. omnes in membrana = Antwerp. Plant. 130  
 (readings)

Auct. S 5 10

A. B. cod. Med. recentes = Laur. 36. 2, 36. 31<sup>34</sup>)

C. D. sunt codices ab Angelo Politiano collati, prior quidem  
 S. Marci alter Mediceus. neuter iam ibi extat<sup>35</sup>)

H. Arondelianus chartaceus = M<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*

30) Alongside lines 174–5 Heinsius noted ‘hactenus O’. Auct. F 2 17 does indeed end with 174, not, as Dörrie says (ed. p. 303 no. 130), with 116. Incidentally, at 13. 43 a hand roughly contemporary with the manuscript has written ‘*l Dispari*’ in the margin.

Before anyone else wastes an hour hunting down J. Oko’s description of the manuscript that ends with 175, it appeared not in *Eos* xviii (1931) but in *Eos* xxxii (1929).

31) Lenz, ed. of *Nux* (Turin 1956) p. 166 n. 2; Dörrie, *op. cit.* (n. 10) 375, 403. It is surprising that Dörrie should now wonder whether this manuscript is the Arondelianus (ed. p. 306).

32) For *Amores*, *A. A.*, *Rem.*, and *Med.*, references are to Kenney’s edition (O.C.T., 1961).

33) Boese presumably forbore to repeat this identification after making it on p. 162.

34) Both manuscripts can be identified from the readings cited by Munari, *S.I.F.C.* xxiii (1949) 138–9. Laur. 33. 31, from which Heinsius took *resorbet* at 2. 16. 26 (Munari p. 139), is there referred to as ‘cod. Medic.’.

35) Politian’s collations were brought to Heinsius’s notice by Is. Vossius in 1642 (*Syll.* III 561). After disappearing from Florence between 1777 and 1833, they were found by Owen in Bodl. Auct. P 2 2 (ed. maior of *Tristia*, pp. xii–xvi). As the manuscripts themselves were given up for lost at Politian’s death and have not since come to light, there is no need to burden this article with readings from them. The character of both and some descendants of the Marcianus are discussed by Lenz, *Rend. Acc. Linc.* VI xiii (1937) 320–70; see also Munari, *S.I.F.C.* xxiii (1949) 141–3. F<sup>12</sup> of *Fasti* is more problematical, at least in the opinion of Lenz pp. 358–65.

At 3. 7. 66 stands the note 'hic incipit fragmentum Hafnien-sis bibliothecae 500 annorum, a'; it is cited up to 11. 1 and again from 13. 7 to 15. 6. It was doubtless to be found in L<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*.

Auct. S 5 7

C. codex chartaceus Mediolani a me emptus = A<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides* 15

1. 1. 30 *enumerata*, 1. 2. 14 *fessi*, 1. 3. 1 *peto*, 2. 1. 9 *miretur*, 2. 5. 5 *puellae*, 3. 2. 1 *repertor*, 3. 13. 1 *pinniferis*

Subjoined are some readings from the Glaserianus, reported as far as 1. 12. 13 by Gruterus in Auct. S 5 13 and from there by Heinsius in Diez B 148 e ff. 73-8.

Epigr. 3 *multa*, 1. 2. 11 *motu concrescere*, 19 *ergo ego*, 42 *comis*, 1. 3. 19 *tu mihi*, 26 *carmina*, 1.4. 15 *vultu tamen*, 43 *coerce*, 50 *pone*, 1. 5. 1 *umbram*

*Amores* 3. 5

Diez 4° 1068

C. codex Palatinus secundus qui inserit lib. III Amorum, inquit Gebhardus, ut ordine sit octava elegia = Vat. Pal. 1655<sup>36</sup>)  
D. MS. Palatinus, quem Gruterus contulerat, incertum an idem cum eo quem Gebhardus tertium vocat = Vat. Pal. 910<sup>37</sup>)

Auct. S 5 10

A. D. 38) F. G. H. of *Amores*

a. ascriptum codici chartaceo Patavino de arte Amandi = F<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides* 15<sup>39</sup>)

36) Cf. Munari, *S.I.F.C.* xxiii (1949) 148. Gebhardus's words in Auct. S 5 6 are, haec elegia in altero MS. Palatino membranaceo III Amor. inseritur, ut sit eiusdem libri ordine octava'.

37) Gebhardus's description of his manuscripts in Auct. S 5 6 removes the uncertainty: ,contuli Amorum libros III cum duobus MSS. membrana-ceis Biblioth. Pal. et uno cartaceo quem ex Gruteri exemplari exscripsi vocaturque 3t.'. See also n. 41.

38) D is cited for 13 vel *albetibus* and 18 vel *ille* (for *ante*), but Heinsius must have fallen victim to a rare oversight, because the text against which Politian collated it does not contain 3. 5. Perhaps the same thing happened as in *Rem.*, where he forgot to change from N to J (see p. 6): after using D for the Patavinus in *Nux*, he forgot to change to a when he passed on to 3. 5, which follows *Nux* with the intervention only of *Pulex*. The inks are consistent with this possibility.

39) The same manuscript, designated by the same letter, is also cited for 2. 6 and 2. 15.

alter Ambros. bibl. cited for 34 *excutiens* } = H 225 inf.<sup>40)</sup>  
 chart. Ambr. bibl. cited for 40 *prona* }

Auct. S 5 7

A. E. G. of *Amores*

a. Vatic. no. 3149, cum libris de Ponto

*Ars Amatoria*

Diez 4<sup>o</sup> 1068

D. primus MS. Palatinus = G<sup>68</sup> of *Heroides*

E. secundus MS. Palatinus = H<sup>68</sup> of *Heroides*

F. tertius Palatinus a Grutero collatus = D<sup>68</sup> of *Amores* 3. 5

G. quartus Palatinus, quem Pal. Gruterus vocat = Vat. Pal.  
 1662<sup>41)</sup>

40) If Heinsius took both readings from H 225 inf., 'alter' is obscure, since no Ambrosianus is cited for the rest of *Amores*. The explanation may be that he had consulted O 23 sup. (1. 4. 1 *nobis epulas* 'cod. Ambros. quem inspexi', and similarly at 1. 14. 8 for *figit opus*). This latter, which contains 3. 5, seems to me to have *exercens* in 34, but Dr. A. Paredi has confirmed my suspicion that it could be read as *excutiens* (or *exoriens*). Nevertheless, since both *excutiens* and *prona* occur unambiguously in H 225 inf., it is simpler to suppose that Heinsius either ignored O 23 sup. or did not choose to record anything from it.

41) Gruterus's collations are extremely untidy and in places barely legible, and his explanation of his symbols is both incomplete and at one point clumsily expressed: 'Contuli haec Ovidiana ad exemplar manuscriptum Palatinum, ideoque notavi litera P. scripta autem fuerat *Ars amandi et remedium Amoris* 1467, uti de se testabatur amanuensis, erantque reliqua eiusdem item manus. Contuli Ovidianam *Artem* cum exemplari vetusto Commelini. Hoc n. notat illud C, ut distinguatur a Palatino. Contuli praeterea cum altero codice etiam (?) *Artem* qui erat e papyro, signoque Pal. aut si consentit cum priore apposui notam binarii, sic: 2, si etiam cum tertio, sic: 3. Gebhardus quem tertium voco appellat puto primum'. The clumsiness lies in 'si etiam cum tertio', by which he must mean 'si etiam tertius'; the incompleteness lies in his failure to give this 'tertius' a proper introduction and to explain what symbols are used when all three are cited.

The impression of confusion created by these prefatory jottings and reinforced by the appearance of the collations themselves can be dispelled by patient perusal. He cites three manuscripts throughout, C, P, and Pal.; from 1. 551 to 3. 126 he adds Pal. ter. or tert., and Pal. becomes Pal. sec. or alter; and from 1. 176 to 528 he cites another Pal. in red. P too is sometimes called Pal., but fainter ink and a finer nib prevent confusion with the other Pal. cited in black. Where the readings of P are crossed out in green, they are not shared by C ('quaecumque hac *Arte* videris viridi deleta, scito ea non haberi item in ms. veterrimo Comelini'); where the symbols 2 and 3 are added to P, they indicate that Pal. sec. and Pal. tert. share its reading.

## Diez 4° 1071

- B. codex Regius ante annos octingentos scriptus venerandae antiquitatis = Paris. Lat. 7311<sup>42)</sup>  
 C. codex eiusdem bibliothecae satis mendose descriptus anno MCCCXV, ut in fine legebatur = Paris. Lat. 7998 (catalogue<sup>43)</sup>)  
 F. codex meus membraneus = Bodl. Rawl. G 108/S.C. 14834 (readings)<sup>44)</sup>  
 H. codex chartaceus quem Angelus Aprosius dono dedit = Diez B Sant. 15 (readings)  
 I. alter codex meus chartaceus = G<sup>71</sup> of *Heroides*

## Auct. S 5 10

- A. (not in the list) = Laur. 36. 2<sup>45)</sup>  
 D. cod. chartaceus S. Antonii Patavii cui et Remedium Amoris et Sapphus epistula et Nux et Medicamen Faciei accedit = F<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides* 15  
 E. cod. Episcopi Tomasini ante annos 300 scriptus aut plures in membr.<sup>46)</sup>  
 F. codex chartaceus Patav. Hectoris Trevisani = D<sup>10</sup> of *Med.*  
 G. cod. Ambrosianus scriptus ante 500 annos = I<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*  
 H. cod. eiusdem biblioth. recentior = F 76 sup. (readings)<sup>47)</sup>

C was identified by Heinsius with his codex Vossii, Leid. Periz. Q 16 (Boese pp. 164-5). Pal. tert., as Gruterus himself surmises, is identical with Gebhardus's pr. (prior), which is doubtless 1668; for 1668 contains *A. A.*, and he collated it for *Her.* and *Amores*. The red Pal. is identical with Gebhardus's 2t. (alter), which ought to be 1707; for 1707 contains *A. A.*, and he collated it for *Heroides*. P, here as elsewhere, is 910, which Gebhardus does not report except at second hand in *Amores* from Gruterus's collation. After these identifications, Pal. can only be 1662, which also contains *Med.* and is therefore the Pal. cited in *Med.* together with P.

As Gruterus refers to Gebhardus and Gebhardus borrows from Gruterus, Gruterus must have collated Pal. and Pal. tert. after 1613, the date of Gebhardus's collations. In *Tristia* at any rate, he had collated P in 1595.

42) Boese presumably intended this identification to be understood from the previous page.

43) *Catalogus Codicum Manuscriptorum Regiae Bibliothecae* (Paris 1744) vol. IV.

44) This manuscript, which was complete when Heinsius collated it, lost 3. 245 - end before it went up for auction (*Bibliotheca Heinsiana* II p. 87 no. 320).

45) A<sup>10</sup> of everything else is 36. 2, and *A. A.* is not missing from it.

46) According to Munari p. 107 n. 2, Tomasini left his books to S. Maria di Vanzo, Padua. This institution was taken over by the Seminary in 1669, but E is not in the Seminary now.

47) The Ambrosianus from which Heinsius recorded *tauri curvis oneran-*

- I. cod. chartaceus Genuensis P. Angeli Aprosii Vintimiliae,  
quem cum alia editione contuli = H<sup>71</sup>  
K. codex chartaceus Bartholi Bartholini<sup>48</sup>)  
L. codex Hafniensis bibliothecae 500 ann. = L<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*  
M. codex chartaceus Arondel. = M<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*

Auct. S 5 7

- N. Argentinensis bibliothecae chartaceus = codex anno 1870  
incendio absumptus<sup>49</sup>)  
O. cod. chart. Johannis Schefferi = Uppsal. Bibl. Univ. C 902  
(readings)<sup>50</sup>  
P. cod. Bernhardi Rottendorphii, 400 annorum = Guelf. Gud.  
Lat. 3 13/4620 (readings)<sup>51</sup>)

1. 2 *erit* E, 29 *favete* K, 53 *devexit* K, 185 *tuis* E, 217 *nuptaeque* E,  
2. 13 *minus* K, 39 *tendere* E, 57 *tuis* K, 3. 3 *arma* K, 67 *citaneos* E,  
102 *cultu* K, 132 *queritis* K, 791 *fovimus* E, 809 *altingis* (for *cycnis*) E

#### *Remedia Amoris*

Diez 4° 1068

- B. codex bibliothecae Bodleianae Oxoniensis etiam recens in  
membrana tamen scriptus = Auct. F 5 6/S.C. 2195 (read-  
ings)

Diez 4° 1071

- L. codex meus chartaceus = H<sup>71</sup> of *A. A.*  
M. alter codex meus chartaceus = G<sup>71</sup> of *Heroides*

---

*tur aratris* at 1. 19 is C 140 inf.; he also consulted H 225 inf. and E 45 sup., though not for more than about 30 readings in all.

48) Dr. Gad informs me that this gentleman, for whom see *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* III (Leipzig 1733) col. 544, auctioned his library or part of it in 1669, and that lot 787 on p. 89 of the auction catalogue is a chartaceus containing 'Tibulli Elegiae, Ovidius de Arte Amandi, Eiusdem de Remedio Amoris, Eiusdem de Medicamine Faciei, Eiusdem de Nuce'. The buyer is unknown.

49) See the *Catalogue Général des Bibliothèques Publiques de France: Départements* XLVII (1923) i.

50) This identification was suggested with due caution by Munari p. 101 n. 2.

51) This identification turned out to have been made already by Kenney, *C. Q.* lvi (1962) 1 n. 4. The Rottendorphiani were sent to Heinsius in 1657-8 (*Syll.* V 263-4).

Auct. S 5 10

- C. codex S. Johannis in Viridario Patavii in charta scriptus = F<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides* 15  
 D. cod. chart. Patavii alter Hectoris Trevisani = D<sup>10</sup> of *Med.*  
 E. codex Bartholi Bartholini chartaceus = K<sup>10</sup> of *A. A.*  
 F. codex 500 annorum Hafniensis bibliothecae = L<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*  
 G. codex Zulichemianus 400 annorum = K<sup>12</sup> of *Tristia*  
 H. codex chart. Arondel. = M<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*

The symbol N, which occurs in this volume from 9 to 21 and again from 94 to 113, is a mistake for J: not only do they never occur together, but on 117 Heinsius has cancelled N and substituted J. He had used N for the same manuscript in *Ars Amatoria*.

Auct. S 5 7

- B. codex chartaceus Mediolani emptus = A<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides* 15?  
 F. codex Farnesian. chartaceus = C<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides* 15  
 M. Reginae codex chartaceus, quem illi donavit V. C. Georgius Turrianus medicus Patavinus = D<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides* 15  
 N. cod. Argentoratensis bibliothecae chartaceus = N<sup>7</sup> of *A. A.*?  
 O. codex quem Vossius dedit, 300 annorum = M<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides*?

27 *vindictet* E, 33 *ivenes furtim* B, 65 *haberet* E, 74 *faveto* B, 80 *et piget* O, 139 *artes* E, 162 *amor* (for *erat*) O, 179 *vel montes* O, 189–90 *colligit was rusticus* O, 199 *cape* B, 211 *didicistis* O, 245 *qui* E, *revelli* B, 325 *infecte* O, 381 *tractandus* O, 713 *sed mores* O, 766 *dulce canunt* O, 798 *effugiat* B

*Medicamina Faciei*

Diez 4° 1068

- A. codex Palatinus a Grutero collatus = D<sup>68</sup> of *Amores* 3. 5  
 B. alter cod. Palatinus ab eodem collat. = G<sup>68</sup> of *A. A.*<sup>52)</sup>

Auct. S 5 10

- C. cod. Patavin. chartaceus S. Antonii = F<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides* 15<sup>53)</sup>  
 D. cod. alter Patav. chart. Hectoris Trevisani = Vind. Bibl. Nat. Lat. 3458\*<sup>54)</sup>

52) Cf. n. 41.

53) The text of *Med.* in Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 19 is very close to that of C.54) The manuscript is V<sub>2</sub> in Lenz's edition (Turin 1965), and the works it contains, with the exception of *Amores* 1. 5, are those for which

E. cod. Ambrosianus in charta = H 225 inf. (readings)  
 G. codex chart. Bartholi Bartholini = K<sup>10</sup> of *A. A.*

Auct. S 5 7

B. codex alter meus chart. Mediolani emptus = A<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides*  
 15<sup>?</sup>

11 *regnante* B, 13 *cubile* G, 19 *laniare* G, 22 *quantus honor* B, 39  
*fundantur* B, 46 *placidus* B, 60 *in hac* G, 66 *hic* G, 73-4, 71-2 B

*Nux*

Diez 4° 1068

C. codex Palatinus, quem Gruterus contulerat = D<sup>68</sup> of *Amores*  
 3. 5<sup>55</sup>)

Diez 4° 1071

C. codex Jesuitarum Lovanii chartaceus = I<sup>71</sup> of *Heroides*

Auct. S 5 10

D. cod. chart. Patav. Eremit. / cod. S. Antonii Patavii in charta  
 = F<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides* 15

F. cod. chart. Thomae Bartholini<sup>56</sup>)

Auct. S 5 7

B. codex Venetiis a Combio mihi donatus = Bodl. Douce  
 146/S. C. 21 720 (readings)<sup>57</sup>)

---

Heinsius cites a 'cod. chart. Hectoris Trevisani': see *Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum* II (Vienna 1868) p. 293. Dr. Mazal informs me that it has been in Vienna since the second half of the 18th century. Among the readings he checked one did not correspond, *Ibis* 132 *hora* Vind., *aura* I.

55) The manuscript is P in Lenz's edition (Turin 1956).

56) If this manuscript really did belong to Thomas Bartholinus, it presumably went up in flames with the rest of his library in 1670: cf. *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* III (Leipzig 1733) col. 547 (nothing further can be learnt from his own dissertation *De bibliothecae incendio*). It is possible, however, that 'Thomae' is a mistake for 'Bartholi': cf. n. 48.

57) There is also on the reverse of the final leaf the signature 'Jo. Bastiano Combi scrisse'. Not that he was actually the scribe: this, as Dr. Hunt observes, was Bartolomeo Sanvito. Several illustrations of Sanvito's hand can be found in J. Wardrop, *the Script of Humanism* (Oxford 1963); see e.g. plates 16, 25, 38. Since Wardrop drew up a list of manuscripts attributable to him (pp. 50-3), others have been discovered; for further bibliography see J. Ruyschaert in vol. 1 of the Supplement to

F. codex Erfortanus Fastis annexus 600 annorum = Gött. Phil.  
127 (catalogue<sup>58</sup>)

10 *argolicae*, 100 *habes*, 158 *levatur*

*Metamorphoses*<sup>59</sup>)

Diez 4° 1069

1. 2. 3. CB = EFG<sup>72</sup>

CG = H<sup>72</sup>

CV = D<sup>72</sup>

Diez 4° 1072

T. de Marinis, *la Biblioteca Napoletana dei Re d' Aragona* (Verona 1969) pp. 267-9 and notes. One of his more interesting products is the Sarravianus of Ovid, which contains *Her.* 21. 15-146; see Kenney, *C. R.* lxxii (1958) 134.

According to *Bibliotheca Heinsiana* II pp. 87-8 no. 333, the Combianus came 'ex Biblioth. D. Grimani Cardinalis S. Marci' (this information must have disappeared when it was bound early in the 19th century). The nearest entries that I can find in the catalogue of Grimani's library (*Vat. Lat.* 3960 = Bodl. MS. film 953) are f. 29r 'Ovidii omnia opera pulcherrima in pergamenis' and f. 124v 'P. Ovidii Nasonis elegia de morte Drusi'.

58) Cf. Wormell, *op. cit.* (n. 2) 47, and *Verzeichniss der Handschriften im preussischen Staate: die Handschriften in Göttingen* I (Berlin 1893) p. 29.

59) References are to Magnus's text (Berlin 1914). Identifications not made by Slater (cf. p. 133) and not mentioned here are to be found in two articles by Munari, one in *Philologus* c (1956) 312-4 and the other in *Ovidiana*, ed. Herescu (Paris 1958) 347-9. See also his *Catalogue of the Mss. of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, *B. I. C. S. Supp.* 4 (1957). I am grateful to Professor Munari for acquainting me with his two supplements to this catalogue in *Riv. Fil.* xciii (1965) 288-97 and *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata* (Rome 1970) 275-80; the first contains descriptions of the Diez manuscripts, most of which were used by Heinsius.

It has sometimes been said, most recently by Wormell, *op. cit.* (n. 2) 56, that no variants in *Met.* are entered in Politian's copy of the ed. Parmensis (cf. n. 35). In fact a handful of readings from A<sup>11</sup> = Marc. 225 are scattered about the earlier books, and from 9. 461 to the end readings that I judge to be from L<sup>8</sup> = Laur. 36. 11 are cited with increasing frequency (e.g. 9. 461 *succrescit*, 755 *nulla est spes una*, 11. 653 *formaque sub ipsa*, 12. 374 *calcabat*, 13. 774 *celeberrime*, 956 *mibi*, 14. 273 *cocti*, 558 *imago*, 844 *aspectasse*, 15. 150 *animos*, 230 *rapidarum*). All these readings are reported in *Auct. S.* 5 11 by Heinsius, who surmises that the former group come from A<sup>11</sup> (e.g. on 7. 223 'Politianus, *Cretes*, forte ex cod. S. Marci, quo videtur usus').

At 15. 162, where Heinsius takes Politian to be citing *sedit* from his manuscript, it is by no means clear that he is. The line is omitted by a printer's error, and Politian has supplied it both in the right-hand margin and at the foot of the page; in the margin he writes *hesit*, but at the foot of the page he writes *sedit* with *hesit* above. If the source of *sedit* was anything more solid than Politian's memory, it was certainly not L<sup>8</sup>, as Dr. Maracchi has confirmed.

- A. codex Collegii S. Johannis Cantabrigiae, ante quadringentos annos scriptus, satis accurate exaratus, cum hac inscriptione, INCIPIT LIBER OVIDII NASONIS METAMORPHOSEOS<sup>60)</sup>
- B. codex Collegii Balliolensis Oxoniae eiusdem fere aetatis cum superiori sed literis admodum minutis scriptus. codex hic erat mutilus et incipiebat lib. IV 117<sup>61)</sup>
- quibus minutum c. ascriptum est lib. X. XI. XII ex Arundeliano codice sunt ante quadringentos annos scripto. reliqua propter reditum in patriam in eum conferre non licuit = O<sup>23)</sup>
- D. codex Vossianus ante trecentos ferme annos scriptus = Leid. Voss. Q 61<sup>62)</sup>
- H. Gronovianus codex, qui vetustatis et scripturae fere eiusdem cum Balliolensi codice = Diez B Sant. 12 (readings)
- I. cod. alter Gronovii, non tam antiquus. desinit lib. XIII cum oratione Ulyssis = Diez B Sant. 9 (readings)
- Excerpta codicis membranacei Andini Ampl. V. Claudii Menardi mecum communicavit Gronovius noster<sup>63)</sup>

Diez 4° 1075

- C. codex Thuani ante quadringentos annos scriptus = Paris. Lat. 8253<sup>64)</sup>
- D. alter codex Thuani, non valde antiquus
- E. codex Regius tertius recens = Paris. Lat. 8017<sup>65)</sup>

60) Mr A.G.Lee kindly tells me that the manuscript was lost by the beginning of the 18th century.

61) This manuscript was lost soon after Heinsius saw it: cf. R.A.B. Mynors, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts of Balliol College Oxford* (Oxford 1963) no. 142.

62) This identification rests on the reading *illa deum* at 15. 804: cf. Slater, *C.R.* xxix (1915) 175.

63) Heinsius received this collation in 1644 (*Syll.* III 133). On Claudius Menardus of Angers see *Syll.* III 91-2 and *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* XX (1739) col. 613.

64) Munari, *Ovidiana* 347, identifies 8253 with D, but only in 8253 was I able to find the readings 1. 8 *in uno* and 15. 878 *plebis*, which Heinsius records from C. Assuming that D had been identified, I noted no readings from it, and the identification therefore remains to be made; the possibilities, unless the manuscript has lost leaves since Heinsius saw it, are 8005, 8008, 8012, and 8014.

65) Boese identifies 8017 with the codex elegantissima manu scriptus, but there is no doubt whatever that it is E (it seems, incidentally, to be copied from the ed. Romana of 1471). 8016 is also elegantissima manu scriptus; its identification with the quartus rests not on this fact alone but also on the absence of any other possibility.

quartus codex elegantissima manu scriptus. cum hoc multis in locis conveniebat = Paris. Lat. 8016

quintum et sextum etiam adhibuimus quibusdam locis. sextus erat chartaceus = Paris. Lat. 8010, 8015 (readings)

Auct. ii R 6 25<sup>66)</sup>

E. codex meus quem Mediolani comparavi, 400 = Diez B Sant. 13 (readings)

F. codex Reginae, 500 = Guelf. Gud. Lat. 159/4463<sup>67)</sup>

G. codex Reginae, 400 = Bodl. Rawl. G 103/S. C. 14829 (readings)

H. cod. chart. Const. Lempereurii<sup>68)</sup>

a. excerpta codicis cum quo Colinaei editio erat collata, quam Langermannus mihi donavit = Bodl. 8° D 218 Linc.<sup>69)</sup>

Auct. S 5 8<sup>70)</sup>

A. codex tertius v. cl. Johannis Frederici Gronovii ante CCCC annos aut D scriptus = Diez B Sant. 10 (readings)

B. codex Johannis Sixii, qui Gruteri olim fuerat, eiusdem aetatis. multa libro primo desiderabantur = Diez B Sant. 5<sup>71)</sup>

C. codex meus quem Johannes Mentelius medicus Parisiensis mihi donavit = Paris. Lat. 8006 (catalogue<sup>72)</sup>)

66) On the evidence of Magnus's apparatus in book 15, the third Ambrosianus occasionally cited in this volume is H 64 sup., and there is no sign that any others were consulted.

67) The manuscript is w<sub>8</sub> in Magnus's edition (where its number is wrongly given as 149), and Dr. Milde has kindly checked some readings in the earlier books. Cf. also n. 93.

68) An earlier collation of the same manuscript appears in Diez 8° 2571, a copy of the ed. Lugdunensis of 1559; it is there described as 'CL. codex chartaceus, quem habui beneficio summi viri Constantini Lempereur'. The same volume also contains earlier collations of the three Leyden manuscripts, 1. 2. 3. CB<sup>69)</sup>.

For Constantinus l'Empereur, professor of Hebrew at Leyden, see *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* VIII (Leipzig 1734) col. 1023-4.

69) A note on 1. 10 reads 'vide codicem scriptum Jo. Fabri Bolani'; I can make nothing of this. The manuscript seems to have lacked roughly 13. 873-14. 347 and 14. 405-end.

70) Besides the two Vatican collated in this volume, G and H, Heinsius also consulted 3266.

71) Cf. Munari's description in *Riv. Fil.* xciii (1965) 291-2. Heinsius disregarded 1. 84-166, which are partially preserved on f. 9.

72) Munari, *Catalogue* no. 245. C and D are two of the four Menteliani given to Heinsius in 1651 (*Syll.* II 285), and the other two are A<sup>7</sup> and B<sup>7</sup> of *Ars Amatoria*. Since all four are now in Paris, he must have returned

- D. alter codex ab eodem mihi donatus 400 annor. = Paris.Lat. 8002 (readings)
- F. bonus, alter Palatinus, sescentorum annorum, in quo quaedam lib. III omnia lib. fere IV deerant = Heid. Pal. 1661<sup>73</sup>)
- M. litera notata sunt ex codice Vaticano excerpta Parmensis editionis, quem Matthaeus Herculanus passim emendarat<sup>74</sup>)
- N. ex altero codice Vaticano Aldinae editionis 1502 a Jo. Calandra emendato ex mss. cui hoc adscriptum: hi libri Ovidiani emendati fuerunt per Jo. Ja. Calandram maxima diligentia in gratiam Divae Isabellae Estensis Mantuanae Marchionissae, edito super his emendationum libro VII Kal. Jun. Anno Sal. MDX<sup>75</sup>)
- O. excerpta ex Aldino codice M. Mureti quem cum MSS. duobus contulerat etc.<sup>76</sup>)
- P. fragmentum apud Patres Oratorios Romae sescentorum annorum ex variis Metamorphoseon libris<sup>77</sup>)

---

them, perhaps in exchange for the other four sent to him 10 years later (*Syll.* II 801). These he kept (*Bibl. Heins.* II p. 87 no. 325, p. 119 no. 634, p. 87 no. 330 or p. 88 no. 335, p. 87 no. 315); they are now Bodl. Auct. F 4 26 (S.C. 8868), Bodl. Auct. F 4 23 (S.C. 8869), Bodl. Rawl. G 102 (S.C. 14828), and Giss. Bibl. Univ. 66. He collated only the last, which is O<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*.

73) This identification has already been made, but I repeat it here because it would not convince someone who compared Heinsius's collation of F with any available description of Heid. Pal. 1661. In fact the leaves in Heid. Pal. 1661 are disarranged, and what it actually omits, besides 15. 632-end, is 3. 600-98, 4. 63-158, 362-464, 567-668.

74) M and N are still in the Vatican (Inc. II 121, Ald. III 16), and O is now there too (Ald. III A 73). As for P, Father Andreu writes that in the 17th century the Theatini had two libraries in Rome, one of which suffered heavy losses during the Napoleonic invasion in 1798, while the books from the other passed to the Biblioteca Nazionale in 1870; as it does not appear to be in the Biblioteca Nazionale, P must have been lost in 1798.

Readings of M include 1. 52-3 *terra ... gravior*, 3. 216 *Lagon*, 4. 1 *Arsinoe*.

75) Readings of N include 1. 53 *pondus aquae levis*, 190 *vulnus vel corpus vel membrum*, 306 *alato*, 2. 583 *begerat*, 4. 282 *tactaque satos Curetas ab Ida*, 7. 472 *Oenonem*.

76) For the complete description see Slater p. 32. Readings of O include 1. 206 *suppressit fremitus*, 527 *vibrabant*, 2. 3 *huius*, 264 *apparent*, 4. 317 *quanquam*, 7. 621 *pignore pignus*, 15. 819 *natusque simul*, 866 *celsus*.

77) Slater gives the symbol for this fragment as  $\Phi$ , P, but the  $\Phi$  is nothing more than a cancelled O. Having begun with M and N on the lower half of the page, Heinsius moved to the top of the page for O; when he made his fourth entry below N, he overlooked O and repeated the symbol, but realizing his mistake he cancelled it and substituted P.

- c. codex meus chartaceus Florentiae emptus, qui multas bonas lectiones habet = Bodl. Auct. F 2 3/S. C. 8858 (readings<sup>78</sup>)
- g. codex Patavinus Ecclesiae Cathedralis ante 400 annos scriptus, quem V. C. Georgius de Turre Medicinae Professor dedit utendum = Patav. Bibl. Capit. C 63<sup>79</sup>)
- h. codex Sti Johannis in Viridario Patavinus quingentorum annorum quem ab eodem Turriano accepi utendum. in illo codice erant adscripta argumenta Luctatii omnia, quae non fuit otium conferre<sup>80</sup>)
- i. codex 500 annorum, quem Langermannus dono mihi dedit = Guelf. Aug. 13. 9 4<sup>o</sup>/3034<sup>81</sup>)
- o. p. quartus et quintus Basileenses, chartacei = Basil. F vi 12, F iii 7 (readings)<sup>82</sup>)
- q. codex Argentinensis bibliothecae 500 circiter annorum = codex anno 1870 incendio absumptus
- r. codex eiusdem bibliothecae chartaceus = sim.<sup>83</sup>)
- w. fragmentum chartaceum, quod Langermannus mihi donavit. incipit pag. 70 usque p. 226 et a pag. 331 usque 365 = Bodl. Auct. F 2 4/S. C. 8859 (readings<sup>84</sup>)

## Auct. S 5 5

- c. (not in the list) fragmentum Caesenas<sup>85</sup>)

---

So far as I can make out, P contained roughly 2. 329-98, 688-771<sup>r</sup> 3. 545-626, 4. 7-92, 567-651, 767-5. 232, 8. 59-227, 515-788, 11. 72-156<sup>r</sup> 640-723, 12. 121-209, 14. 594-671. In Heinsius's edition it is referred to on 4. 650 as 'schedae vetustissimae Theatinorum Romae'. Distinctive readings include 3. 552 *furore*, 4. 647 *servare*, 5. 48 *Ligneis*, 8. 736 *nitidarum*.

78) Since Heinsius collated it, this manuscript has lost 3. 397-4. 358.

79) As Munari, *Catalogue* no. 279, puts the manuscript in the 15th century, it seemed advisable to check the identification. 14th looks a reasonable compromise.

I take this opportunity of pointing out that the other manuscript at present in Padua, *Catalogue* no. 280, also omits 11. 586-661, 13. 81-156.

80) For a piece of negative information about this much lamented manuscript see *C. Q.* (forthcoming)

81) The manuscript is w<sub>3</sub> in Magnus's edition, and some readings both in book 15 and elsewhere have been checked by Dr. Milde.

82) The identifications suggested by Slater and accepted by Munari are wrong.

83) Cf. n. 49.

84) Since Heinsius collated it, this fragment has lost two leaves before 3. 475.

85) Cf. the last paragraph of n. 9. Langermann has written 'desinit (? deficit) fragm. Caesen.' after 13. 403, and the collation covers 9. 235-11. 169, 13. 2-403.

## Auct. ii R 6 23

- A. B. duo codices Balthasaris Moreti ante annos DC scripti  
 C. eiusdem codex, scriptus ante annos D = Antwerp. Plant. 51  
 (readings)<sup>86)</sup>  
 D. eiusdem codex scriptus ante annos CCCC  
 a. fragmentum eiusdem scriptum ante annos D, in quo tres aut  
 quatuor libri hic illic<sup>87)</sup>  
 K. codex Bernardi Rottendorphii, 500 annorum = Guelf. Gud.  
 Lat. 123/4427<sup>88)</sup>  
 q. excerpta Francisci Jureti, quae vir ampliss. Philippus de la  
 Mare mecum communicavit = Diez 8° 2541, from Divio-  
 nensis 497<sup>89)</sup>  
 d. fragmentum Zulichemianum libri circiter unius, 500 anno-  
 rum<sup>90)</sup>  
 L. codex Constantini Hugonii Zulichemii, qui Plantini olim  
 fuerat, 500 annorum<sup>91)</sup>  
 O. codex Arondelianus, 500 annorum = Leid. Voss. O 51<sup>92)</sup>  
 Q. (codex) Rogerii Twisden Baroneti, 400 annorum<sup>93)</sup>

---

86) The identification was suggested by Munari, *Catalogue* no. 16.

87) The fragment seems to have contained roughly 1. 155-78, 536-618, 5. 648-7. 78, 8. 258-665, 876-9. 89, 9. 197-298, 513-615, 721-10. 24, 13.8-820. Its readings include 1. 155 *subiectis aethera nimbis*, 178 *enixus*, 7. 5 *quondam*, 9. 45 *premebat*, 60 *fruitur*, 13. 68 *notatum*, 76 *minimumque hic*.

Heinsius saw these Moretani in 1653 (*Syll.* III 320).

88) The manuscript is w<sub>6</sub> in Magnus's edition. Cf. also n. 51.

89) The excerpta were promised and sent in 1653 but not received until 1655 (*Syll.* V 677-9). As they stop at 15. 546, it seemed advisable to confirm that Juretus's manuscript of *Met.* was the same as his manuscript of the elegiac works. It was, and there is no apparent reason why the excerpta should stop where they do.

90) The fragment seems to have contained roughly 5. 34-6. 137, 15. 228-322, 742-831. Its readings include 5. 48 *Limidate ... antris*, 15. 229 *Minos*, 233 *bis sit*, 271 *claudit*, 749 *comatam*, 777 *expellite*, 831 *ille*.

91) Heinsius saw the Zulichemiani in 1657 (*Syll.* III 372-6). All I can say about this one is that it is not Bruxell. 14620.

92) The manuscript is v in Magnus's edition, and it already lacked 1. 643-722 (cf. Munari, *Catalogue* no. 148) when Heinsius collated it. As is shown by its signature, it came to Leyden, like the Arondelianus of *Fasti*, in the collection of Is. Vossius. Lenz, *op. cit.* (n. 4) 75 no. 5, need not have supposed that the Arondelianus of *Fasti* is improperly named (by Heinsius, does he mean?). Cf. also n. 21.

93) This manuscript is not Mus. Brit. Burney 223. It apparently stopped at 14. 537, and after 10. 386 Heinsius noted 'deest folium in Q' (citations resume at 475).

- R. codex bibliothecae Noricae, 300 annorum = Norimb. Bibl. Civ. Cent. V 56 (readings)<sup>94</sup>  
 S. codex Joh. Georgii Graevii, 400 annorum<sup>95</sup>  
 l. excerpta ex codice Leodicensi S. Jacobi libri primi  
 m. excerpta ex codice Caroli Langii  
 n. fragmentum veterrimum Leodicense unius folii initio lib. I. has schedas mecum communicavit Val. Andreas = Diez B 148 e ff. 237-41<sup>96</sup>  
 o. lib. II et III ex codice Helmstadiensi, quem (?) Langermannus mecum communicavit<sup>97</sup>

Orba 3 edita prisco h, ib. 4 habebat h, 1. 18 nam H, 22 dissipat D, 24 evolvit B, 28 aer coelo A<sup>72</sup>, 42 uberioris H, 46 quintaque A<sup>72</sup>, 52 eminent Men., 57 habendi H, 69 decreverat a, 71 mundo B, 91 scisso A<sup>72</sup>, fulvo S, 100 faciebant A<sup>23</sup>, 105 horrentia H, 109 matura L, 110 candebat h, 112 sudabant L, 116 aeterni D, 118 divisit D, 125 et aenea A<sup>72</sup>, 143 percutit a, 145 gloria A<sup>23</sup>, 148 incurrit A<sup>72</sup> incurrit honores Men., 159 iacerent D, 168 declinis Men., 181 minis H, solvis A<sup>23</sup>, 193 et nymphae et satyri Q, 196 en satis B, 212 de summo labor A<sup>72</sup>, 258 proles obsessa A<sup>72</sup>, 262 condit B, 296 ab ulmo a, 303 pulsataque Men., 311 hominum Men., 361 modo L, 363 recreare Q, 376 dedit simul B, 395 arbitrio B, 403 mollior L, 404 quaedam quae non Q, 478 hanc multi A<sup>23</sup>, 484 ora v. suffundit pulchra Q, 492

94) This manuscript was sent to Heinsius by Chr. Arnoldus in 1660 (Syll. III 411, 414, 416, 447). The negotiations illustrate not only the hazards of conveying manuscripts at the time but also Heinsius's extreme scrupulousness.

95) From 9. 549 to the end, S almost invariably agrees with F<sup>25</sup>.

96) Cf. Boese p. 162 n.I. In the *schedae* the three manuscripts are called 'L. exemplar pulcerrimum S. Jacobi Leodii. C. Caroli Langii exemplar. F. fragmentum vetustissimum unius folii'. L is cited up to 3, 198, C hardly at all, and F up to 1. 114 and also, it seems, at 170 (*tyranni* 'in lib. antiquiss.') and 428 (*numeris*).

Readings of L include 1. 24 *latentia acervo*, 41 *partimque recepta*, 69 *discerpserat*, 91 'tres versus desunt in L', 173 *fronte*, 360 *doleres*; of C, 2. 116 *quem petere* (conjectured by Merkel); of F, 1. 11 *nascendo*, 18 *corpora in unum*, 69 *vix a limitibus disseperat*.

There is no trace of L in the *Catalogue des Livres de la Bibliothèque de la célèbre ex-abbaye de St Jacques à Liège* (1788).

97) I cannot find any citations from o either in books 2 and 3 or elsewhere in the work, and there is no manuscript of *Met.* among the Helmstadiensens at Wolfenbüttel.

Slater misread 'II et III' as 'II. VII'. His transcription contains several other errors, most of them tacitly corrected here because they are not very important.

*densis* A<sup>23</sup>, 539 *salute* a, 565 *laudis* a, 566 *Titan* Men., 577 *primo* Men., 679 *consistere* Men., 747 *hic inseruntur argumenta libri secundi* in h, 2. 14 *qualis* Q, 5. 42 *committunt* S, 15. 24 *plura ac graviora* B, 26 *taciteque* L, 34 *extimuit ... palam* A<sup>23</sup>, 42 *iustos* B, 45 *impositos effundit* L, 51 *nafretum* B, 61 *odiumque* L, 70 *sonarent* L, 71 *micarent* D *manerent* S, 75 *profanis* B, 83 *sedent* A<sup>23</sup>, 105 *congressit* B, 107 *patet* D, 137 *extis* B, 177 *constat* A<sup>23</sup>, 193 *tollitur* H, 219 *districtae* L, 249 *retegitur* D, 794 *placet* S, 813 *abscissa* D, 833 *sciet* Men., 836 *sanctam prolem* B, 839 *servet* H, 842 *promus ab* L, 844 *ipsa venus* A<sup>72</sup>, 847 *increscere* A<sup>23</sup>, 862 *quirinus* L, 864 *secreta* L, 870 *faciantque* H, 873 *quae non nisi* Men.

*Fasti*<sup>98)</sup>

Auct. S. 5 12

M. cod. chart. S. Johannis in Viridario Patavii<sup>99)</sup>

N. ante 300 annos scriptus, sed ex optimo libro, etsi nonnunquam mendosus est, Eremitanorum Patavii

O. tertius Patavinus Franciscanorum in charta scriptus = Vicentinus Bibl. Bertolianae 326 (readings)<sup>100)</sup>

1. 15 *contenti* N, 34 *statuit anno* N, 50 *erit (for erat)* N, 131 *externo* M, 4. 37 *petita (for spectata)* M, 5. 39 *parantur* M, 58 *cura* M, 6. 1 *varias* M, 6 *nomina* M, 41 *aras* M, 58 *nomen* M, 105 *averni* N, 169 *gestentur* N, 187 *quam leve* N

*Tristia*<sup>101)</sup>

98) References are to Bömer's text (Heidelberg 1957). The other 55 manuscripts of *Fasti* used by Heinsius were identified by Alton: see Wormell, *op. cit.* (n. 2).

The additional Medicei occasionally cited in Auct. S 5 12 are no doubt identical with the three later reported more fully in Auct. S 5 9, Q, R, and S. Certainly the reading of 'alius cod. Med.' at 4. 695 is the reading of R.

99) This manuscript, which is absent from the catalogue of 1760 (cf. n. 18), is cited first at 1. 83 for *securi (for iuveni)* and last at 6. 553 for *fertur (for solita est)*. Heinsius says that it omitted 2. 133-210, and there may have been another omission between 3. 740 and 841.

100) That the Paduan manuscript of *Ex Ponto* is now at Vicenza suggested that the manuscript of *Fasti* at Vicenza might also have come from Padua. Dr. Cristofari established that it is O.

101) For *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto* references are to Owen's ed. minor (O.C.T., 1915). L<sup>9</sup> of *Tristia*, the Medonianus, was identified by Owen, ed. maior (Oxford 1889) xxx, with Bodl. Rawl. G 107.

Diez 4° 1073

CP. cod. Pirckheimerianus, cuius excerpta mihi misit Gronovius.  
in eo haec argumenta singulis Elegiis praeponerentur =  
M<sup>12 102</sup>)

II. Palat. prior membranaceus, alter in charta, hac distincti  
litera, A.B. = HI<sup>70</sup>  
litera C. codex Bibl. Leidensis membranaceus notatur =  
B<sup>76 103</sup>)

Diez 4° 1076

a. fragmentum quod librum primum continebat et penes me est  
ex dono Cl. V. Jacobi Revii, aliis quibusdam collectaneis  
annexum. fuerat olim Petri Danielis Aurelii<sup>104</sup>)

Diez 4° 1070

B. codex Puteaneus ante quadringentos annos scriptus = Paris.  
Lat. 7993

C. codex alius Gallicus = Paris. Lat. 8239<sup>105</sup>)

G. codex Lovaniensis Buslidianus, qui Petri Nannii<sup>106</sup>) olim  
fuerat = Lovan. Bibl. Univ. 18, anno 1914 incendio  
absumptus<sup>107</sup>)

102) Cf. the last paragraph of n. 21.

103) Yet another collation of this manuscript appears in Auct. S 5 1  
(Munari p. 99).

104) The fragment broke off at 1. 8. 26 and was followed at an  
interval by *Nux* 1-56 and a few lines from *Amores* 3. 5 and *Ibis*. For  
Jacobus Revius see *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* XXXI (Leipzig 1742) col.  
946-7.

105) The identification of B and C was made by Owen, ed. maior  
p. xviii, and I have verified the identification of C. By mistakenly calling B  
Puteaneus instead of Regius, Heinsius has caused a certain amount of  
confusion: see Lenz, *op. cit.* (n. 4) 81-2 no. 47.

106) Nannius was professor of Latin at the Collegium Buslidianum  
and died in 1557: see *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* XXIII (Leipzig 1740) col.  
588-9. Some at least of his books were auctioned: cf. G. Pollard and A. Ehr-  
man, *the Distribution of Books by Catalogue to A. D. 1800* (Cambridge 1965)  
216, where read 'Nannii' for 'Namin'.

107) By a stroke of good fortune a photograph of one leaf from this  
manuscript can be found in E. Reusens, *Éléments de Paléographie* (Louvain  
1899) plate XXXII no. 2, referred to by E. de Moreau, *la Bibliothèque de  
l'Université de Louvain 1636-1914* (Louvain 1918) 51. It came from the  
Collège des Trois Langues, which was founded early in the 16th century by  
Hieronymus Buslidius: see e.g. Val. Andreas, *Collegii Trilinguis Buslidiani  
in Academia Lovaniensi Exordia ac Progressus* (Louvain 1614).

- H. codex Palatinus = G<sup>68</sup> of *Heroides*  
 I. alter Palat. = D<sup>68</sup> of *Amores* 3. 5<sup>108</sup>)

## Auct. S 5 12

- C. codex Barberinorum ante annos 500 scriptus = Vat. Barb.  
 Lat. 59 (catalogue<sup>109</sup>)  
 D. Eremitanorum Patavii = C<sup>12</sup> of *Ex Ponto*  
 G. Hafniensis 500 annorum = L<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*  
 a. fragmentum quod a Boxhornio habui, in quo liber tantum  
 unus et alter foliis hinc inde corrosis, scriptum ante 300  
 annos = Leid. Bibl. Publ. 180 G (catalogue<sup>110</sup>)  
 H. cod. quem a Vossio habui, 400 annorum = G<sup>12</sup> or H<sup>12</sup> of  
*Ex Ponto*?  
 K. Zulichemianus 400 annorum = Leid. Bibl. Publ. Lips. 51  
 (catalogue<sup>111</sup>)  
 L. Rottendorphii 400 annor. = Guelf. Gud. Lat. 192/4496  
 (readings)<sup>112</sup>  
 M. chartaceus Arondelianus = M<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*

## Auct. S 5 9

- A. codex Richelianus 400 annorum = Paris. Bibl. Genovevensis  
 Y 1 3/2408<sup>113</sup>)  
 B. codex quem mihi dedit Combii librarii filius Venetiis = B<sup>7</sup> of  
*Nux*  
 H. cod. Medic. 400 annor. = Laur. 36. 33  
 I. cod. Med. recens = Laur. 36. 2<sup>114</sup>)

---

108) Gebhardus's collations, which were Heinsius's source for the readings of these two manuscripts, are preserved in Diez 8<sup>o</sup> 2591, a copy of the ed. Francofurtana of 1582 (Merkel p. XXII understandably but wrongly attributes them to Dan. Heinsius). The first volume of the set is Auct. S 5 6 (cf. Munari p. 113). In the second, Diez 8<sup>o</sup> 2590, he collated four Palatini of *Met.*, of which the first is F<sup>8</sup>.

109) S. Prete, *Codices Barberiniani Latini* (Vatican 1968) p. 101.

110) *Op. cit.* (n. 14) p. 89.

111) Geel, *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum qui inde ab anno 1741 Bibliothecae Lugduno Batavae accesserunt* (Leyden 1852) no. 360. The identification turned out to have been made already by de Vries, *Handelingen van het Tweede Nederlandsche Philologen-Congres* (1900) 64-70, though apparently he was unaware that Heinsius had used the same manuscript for *Rem.* as well. Cf. also n. 91.

112) Cf. n. 51.

113) The manuscript is C in Owen's ed. maior.

114) H can be identified from Owen's ed. maior or simply from Bandini's catalogue. 36. 2 is already familiar.

K. codex Caroli Strozzae, 400 annorum = Laur. Strozz. 124  
(catalogue<sup>115</sup>)

1. 5. 44 *Caesaris*, 1. 6. 32 *excidet*, 2. 10 *acceptis referor*, 41 *moderati-*  
*tior*, 42 *iura*, 61 *quos carmina dicis*, 5. 9. 29 *cardinis*, 5. 14. 17  
*quaesta* (for *muta*)

*Ex Ponto*<sup>116</sup>)

Diez 4° 1073

CP. codex Pircheimerianus, cuius excerpta beneficio Cl. Gronovii  
mei habeo = M<sup>12</sup> 117)

CG. codex Gronovii chartaceus, cuius usum mihi dedit idem =  
Diez B Sant. 18 (readings)

Auct. S 5 12

C. codex Patavinus Eremitanorum scriptus anno 1468 = Vicen-  
tinus Bibl. Bertolianae 153 (catalogue<sup>118</sup>)

E. codex bibliothecae Hafniensis 500 annorum = L<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*

F. alter eiusdem bibliothecae eadem aetate<sup>119</sup>)

G. H. I. tres Vossiani codices ante CCC aut CCCC annos scripti  
= ?, ?, Bodl. Auct. F 2 1/S. C. 8861 (readings)

L. codex equitis Rogerii Twisdenii 600 annorum = Mus. Brit.  
Burney 220 (catalogue, readings)

M. chartaceus Arondelianus = M<sup>10</sup> of *Heroides*

a. fragmentum quod a Boxhornio habui, ante 300 annos scrip-  
tum, in quo tres priores libri = a<sup>12</sup> of *Tristia*<sup>120</sup>)

Auct. S 5 9

A. B. Thuanæi codices membr. 400 annorum = Paris. Lat.  
8256, 8462 (readings<sup>121</sup>)

115) Cf. Wormell, *op. cit.* (n. 2) 55, and vol. II of Bandini's *Supple-*  
*mentum* (Florence 1792) col. 505.

116) K<sup>12</sup> was identified by Korn, ed. of *Ex Ponto* (Leipzig 1868) xxvi,  
with Guelf. Gud. Lat. 228/4533.

117) Cf. the last paragraph of n. 21.

118) Mazzatinti, *Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia* II  
(1892) p. 44.

119) Cf. n. 20.

120) The manuscript as described in the catalogue, *op. cit.* (n. 14)  
p. 89, does not contain all that it contained when Heinsius collated it:  
the collation continues to 3. 5. 56 and resumes from 3. 8. 6 to 4. 7. 12.  
Dr. Obbema writes that the present binding dates from about 1700.

121) Among the readings in 8256 checked by Dr. Laffitte one did  
not correspond, 4. 3. 21 *aut age die* 8256, *dic age nunc* A. For an interesting  
variant in this manuscript see *C.Q.* (forthcoming).

- C. codex meus, quem Venetiis a Combio habui = B<sup>7</sup> of *Nux*  
 H. Farnesianus 500 annorum = Neapol. Bibl. Nat. IV F 17  
 (readings)  
 L. Medicus 600 annor. = Laur. 36. 32  
 M. alter recens = Laur. 36. 2  
 N. tertius chartaceus Medicus = Laur. 36. 30<sup>122)</sup>  
 O. P. duo codices mei 400 annorum, a Medonio donati = Bodl.  
 Rawl. G 106, 105/S. C. 14832, 14831 (readings)<sup>123)</sup>

1. 1. 41 *turpe* H, 53 *hanc* G, 1. 2. 16 *sanguine tela* H, 1. 3. 21  
*podalirius* H, 56 *cultaque* G, 1. 4. 49 *ergo dii facerent* G, 2. 1. 12  
*neget* H, 21 *vidi* H, 2. 3. 1 *implet* G, 2. 4. 4 *en partes ... meas* H,  
 9 *collecta* G, 28 *bistonias* G, 4. 1. 4 *cura* G *fama* H, 18 *meminisse*  
 (for *tamen esse*) H, 4. 3. 30 *excipis* G

*Ibis*

Diez 4° 1076

- A. codex A. V. Claudii Sarravii cuius excerpta mecum communi-  
 cavit Gronovius = A<sup>70</sup>

Diez 4° 1070

- C. codex Petavianus non valde antiquus  
 H. codex meus in membrana = Diez B Sant. 27 (readings)  
 J. codex meus in charta = K ut vid.<sup>124)</sup>  
 K. alter codex meus in charta = G<sup>71</sup> of *Heroides*

Auct. S 5 12

- A. B. C. D. codices sunt Medicei recentiores = Laur. 36. 2,  
 36. 31, 36. 21, 33. 31<sup>125)</sup>  
 H. cod. Patav. Heremitarum eodem anno scriptus . . 1468 =  
 C<sup>12</sup> of *Ex Ponto*  
 I. cod. Patav. chartaceus Hectoris Trevisani = D<sup>10</sup> of *Med.*

122) Bandini's catalogue leaves little room for doubt about these identifications, but Dr. Maracchi has very kindly confirmed them.

123) Cf. n. 23.

124) In his list at the front of the volume Heinsius originally omitted the codex alius Gallicus, so that F stood for the codex Moreti, G for codex meus in membrana, and H for codex meus in charta. When he entered the correct description of F in the margin, he altered F.G.H. to G.H.J., but for some reason he also added K. alter codex meus in charta. As there is no collation of J, it must be a doublet of K that owes its origin to the change of symbols.

125) These manuscripts can all be identified from Lenz's edition (Turin 1956).

64 *nunc matutino*, 71 *sidera cum radiis*, 128 *spemque ... alam*, 168 *indignum*

*Consolatio ad Liviam*

Auct. S 5 12

A. cod. Mediceus = Laur. 36. 2<sup>126</sup>)

B. prima editio quae penes me

Auct. S 5 9

A. codex Venetiis a Combio mihi datus in quo *Tristia et Pontica* = B<sup>7</sup> of *Nux*<sup>127</sup>)

B. codex scriptus 1493 quem Renerus Anslo<sup>128</sup>) Romae mecum communicavit = Vat. Lat. 1621<sup>129</sup>)

C. codex v. c. Venet. 1474 cuius in margine multa manu viri docti notata erant, ex veteri codice, ut opinor. habui a Jo. Rhodio<sup>130</sup>)

D. codex quem Langermannus mihi donavit in quo omnia Ovidii praeter *Metamorphos.* scriptus ante 200 annos = P<sup>7</sup> of *Heroides* 15

E. veterrima editio

F. alia veterrima editio. neutri annus adscriptus

G. ed. Veneta 1486

*Halieuticon*

Auct. S 5 10

vet. cod. chart. Ambros. Biblioth. (ad fin.) in v. c. postea sequebatur *Cunegeticon* = S 81 sup.

126) Cf. Lenz's edition (Turin 1956) p. 165.

127) Since there are so few manuscripts of this work, a collation of A may not come amiss. It differs from Lenz's D as follows: 9 *hei*, 11 *est*, 24 *coli est*, 49 *campoque foroque*, 57 *quod*, 75 *numina*, 79 *turba*, 81 *genitrice*, 88 *hei*, 93 *mortem*, 95 *et<sup>1</sup> at<sup>2</sup>*, 101 *zephyris*, 106 *daunias*, 111 *clymeneides*, 176 *hei*, 185 *vindice<sup>1</sup> iudice<sup>2</sup>*, 223 *amplexum*, 379 *quod es alte quod foetibus*, 403 *iunonis grais*, 438 *coniunx*, 473 *coniunx*. It shares some of its spelling with H (*hei*, *genitrice*, *coniunx*).

128) This gentleman, a Dutch poet, went to Italy in 1649: see *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* II (Leipzig 1732) col. 470.

129) The manuscript is Lenz's V.

130) For Johannes Rhodius, 'ein berühmter Artzt, Philologus und Antiquarius', see *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* XXXI (Leipzig 1742) col. 1167; Tomasini's catalogue of the Paduan libraries (1639) pp. 136-41; *Syll.* V 442-67 and III *passim*.

Auct. S 5 7

v. c. Thuan. in quo Juvenalis, multa Martialis et varia catalecta.  
(ad fin.) mox sequitur Cynegeticon Gratii. codex est ante  
700 aut 800 annos scriptus = Paris. Lat. 8071<sup>131</sup>)

Next, some notes on the *excerpta* used by Heinsius, the nature of which has been clearer since Boese published his article (p. 173).

#### *Salmasiana Excerpta*

These were available in *schedae* as early as 1637, when Salmasius lent them to Gronovius (*Syll.* II 538–41). Gronovius transferred them to a copy of the ed. Colon. of 1555, now Diez 8° 2564; this copy seems later to have been collated by Santen with Lugd. Bibl. Publ. 755 H 12, a copy of the ed. Amst. of 1630 from the library of Is. Vossius containing similar *excerpta* for part of *Heroides*<sup>132</sup>. It was presumably from Gronovius's copy that Heinsius drew his knowledge of Salmasius's *excerpta*, even though in his note on *Her.* 13. 135 he cites Salmasius's conjecture *Troasin* from Gronovius's *Observationes*.

As there is no doubt that Salmasius's manuscripts were Parisinus 8242 and Divionensis 497, his *excerpta* are redundant except that they include his conjectures.

#### *Puteani Excerpta*

The oldest extant source of these is Diez B 148e ff. 116r–117r. At the head of f. 116r Heinsius has written: 'Erant hae collationes in octo schedia coniectae, ut numerus singulis chartis praefixus designabat, sed tria prima desiderantur, et a quarto incipiebant. Forsan incuria possessoris perierint. Transmisit ea ad me Fabricius a P. Puteano ea nactus<sup>133</sup>). Notandum autem haec schedae 4 excerpta ex diverso a ceteris codice notata'.

The *schedae* other than 4 contain readings from Parisinus 8242, in *Amores* as far as 3. 5. 40 but in *Heroides* only for 3. 4–39 and 19. 165–209; the numbering of page and line follows the ed. Plantiniana of 1575. *Sch.* 4 contains 'excerpta Puteani a Puteaneo codice diversa' (Heinsius on *Her.* 2. 73), in *Heroides* as far as

<sup>131</sup>) For these two manuscripts see Richmond's edition (London 1962) pp. 9, 6.

<sup>132</sup>) These *excerpta* were published by Burgersdijk, *op. cit.* (n. 14).

<sup>133</sup>) He sent them in June 1639 and had them back by February 1640 (*Syll.* III 792, 795).

12. 172, in *Amores* to the end, and in *A. A.* as far as 2. 239; the numbering follows the ed. Gryph. of 1546. On the source of these *excerpta* see under *Excerpta Scaligeri*<sup>134</sup>).

### *Excerpta Scaligeri*

Boese found *excerpta Scaligeri* cited for *Amores* and *A. A.* in ff. 73–94 of Diez B 148 e; Korn had already used Diez 4° 1076 for *excerpta Scaligeri* of *Ex Ponto*. The origin of all these *excerpta* is Diez 8° 2560, a copy of the ed. Gryph. of 1546<sup>135</sup>); it also contains marginal readings in *Heroides* (= MS<sup>74</sup>), *Remedia*, and *Fasti*.

The readings entered in red are almost all from Parisinus 8242; I can vouch for two exceptions, *Her.* 7. 125 *petiere*, 20. 143 *abscindere*. In *Amores* and *A. A.* the readings entered by Scaliger himself agree so closely with the *excerpta Puteani* of *sch.* 4, which as it happens were also based on the ed. Gryph. of 1546, that there must be some relationship of dependence between them; priority apparently belongs to Scaliger, who gives a few readings not found in the *excerpta Puteani* (e.g. *Am.* 1. 5. 10 *diffusa*, 2. 5. 29 *defers*, *A. A.* 1. 160 *supposuisse*). His source for *Amores* was a manuscript that read e.g. 1. 4. 23 *queraris*, 48 *superiecta*, 1. 6. 6 *subtili*, 21 *mea gratia*, 41 *prodit amanti*, 64 *perpetuo*, 2. 3. 6 *parte fuisset*. His source for *A. A.* bears a strong resemblance to Parisinus 7311 (e.g. 3. 527 *vite*, 709 *passis*) and in spite of discrepancies (1. 244 *venis*, 581 *sorte*, 2. 164 *valet*) is unlikely to have been anything else; the resemblance is equally marked in *Remedia* (e.g. 446 *haesaque*). His source for *Ex Ponto* contained e.g. the following readings not yet found in any known manuscript: 1. 2. 33 *transmutor*<sup>136</sup>), 76 *vix bene*, 138 *socias*<sup>137</sup>), 1. 3. 37 *litore*, 1. 4. 36 *densa*. About *Heroides* my notes do not allow me to speak; I cannot say, for instance, whether the *excerpta Puteani* derive from Scaliger, though I should be surprised if they did<sup>138</sup>).

134) Heinsius thought that it was some Italian manuscript or manuscripts: 'Adiectum erat insuper schedium cum longe diverso codice collatum, quo in Italia Claudius Puteanus, eius enim praeferebat manum, usus aliquando videbatur' (*Syll.* III 558–9).

135) Cf. Heinsius's note at the beginning of *Ex Ponto*.

136) Perhaps *transmittor*; beyond *trans-* I cannot trust my notes.

137) In Korn's apparatus D must be a misprint for O, since D does not read *socias*.

138) Heinsius in his edition cites the ill-attested couplets at the opening of *Epp.* 5, 6, 7, and 10 (he could have done the same in 11 and 12) from the

If editors still have to cite the *excerpta Scaligeri*, recourse to Diez 8° 2560 may obviate uncertainties, e. g. at *Rem.* 73, where Kenney's apparatus can be altered from 'dominis *an* domini *incert. exc. Scal.*' to 'dominis *exc. Scal.*' (if, that is, it is not a conjecture: the usual 'v.' for *vetus codex* is lacking).

### *Vossiana Excerpta*

These are scattered about Diez B 148e; the correct order is ff. 298–305, 55–62, 97–104, 63–72 (*Her.*, *Am.*, *Rem.*, *Pulex*, *Met.*, *Fasti*, *Trist.*, *Pont.*). On f. 298r Heinsius has written: 'Variae Lectiones in Ovidium adiectae ad marginem Lugdunensis editionis apud Ant. Vincentium MDLXIV quas mecum communicavit Doctiss. Juvenis, GERARDUS VOSSIUS GER. FIL.'<sup>139</sup>); at *Fasti* 5. 22 he has noted 'hic desinunt excerpta in Fastos' and at *Met.* 6. 107 'hic desinunt excerpta Metamorph.'

The source of these *excerpta* is twofold: (1) a collation of Parisinus 8242 (VL in *Heroides* and *Amores*); (2) collations entered in a difficult hand, probably Carrio's (cf. 'quae a Carrione olim videbantur congesta' on f. 73r<sup>140</sup>), on ff. 178–215 of Diez B 148e. These latter cover (one manuscript each) *Her.*, *Am.*, *Pulex*, *Met.* (to the end), *Trist.*, and *Pont.*, and (two manuscripts each) *Remedia* and *Fasti* (to the end). Parisinus 8245 was used for *Am.*, *Pulex*, *Rem.*, and *Fasti* (verified for all but *Pulex*); I do not know what the other manuscripts were<sup>141</sup>.

*excerpta Puteani* without mentioning Scaliger. Apart from these couplets, the *excerpta* for *Heroides* for the following readings (references are again to Dörrie's text): 1. 90 *dilaniantur*, 116 *venies*, 2. 20 *ille venit*, 73 *hoc tua post illum titulo*, 76 *relicta*, 98 *fac*, 142 *libet*, 3. 30 *blandas ... preces*, 34 *septem*, 39 *Atride*, 57 *hora*, 4. 41 *prensis*, 58 *suo*, 79 *recurvas*, 127 *immeriti ... vereare*, 150 *hei mihi*, 5. 4 *esse*, 20 *longa*, 63 *cognovi*, 110 *volant*, 128 *arte*, 150 *deficior*, 157 *et*, 6. 27 *raptis*, 37 *devictus serpens*, 59 *sed*, 100 *volet*, 103 *Phasidis*, 115 *capillos*, 131 *o tu*, 143 *comitante*, 7. 6 *novimus*, 9 *Didon*, 10 *ferunt*, 19 *tibi restat habendus*, 41 *instat*, 48 *careas*, 75 *parcas*, 87 *perdant*, 112 *negandus*, 149 *vitaque*, 151 *remissa*, 8. 25 *nec*, 92 *dedi*, 9. 4 *inficenda*, 77 *cressaque*, 81 *crederis*, 92 *Gerionis*, 96 *dives ab*, 10. 5 *littore me somnusque in quo male perdidit et tu*, 17 *per littora*, 21 *clamavi*, 50 *sedens*, 71 *victus*, 126 *urbis ... in arce*, 11. 6 *soluta*, 19 *admoto*, 28 *tepere*, 88 *vocabat*, 12. 29 *Scythiam ... nivosam*, 73 *nescis*, *ib. illuc*, 74 *orsus*, 79 *iuuamen*, 96 *findis*, 98 *babet*, 104 *toto ... versat*, 105 *tibi*, 139 *ut subito nostras Hymen*, 167 *rapui*, 172 *nec teneram misero p.s.b.*

139) Cf. *Syll.* III 558 (?).

140) Miss de la Mare, who has inspected a xerox of the hand, sees no objection to a date at the end of the sixteenth century.

141) The second manuscript of *Remedia* read e.g. 22 *actor*, 34 *capto*, 47 *quod*, 99 *parasses*, 101 *primum*, 119 *est om.*, 136 *fugias monitis*, 139 *artes*, 146 *cassa*. The second manuscript of *Fasti*, which is no. 40 in Merkel's

*Excerpta Douzæ*

These appear in Diez 8° 2576–8, a copy of the ed. Plantiniana of 1566–7. I cannot say anything about the relationship between the *excerpta* of *Fasti* in 2578 and the *excerpta Douzæ* of *Fasti* in Bodl. Auct. ii R 6 21.

Finally some notes at random on other collations of Ovid in the Diez collection.

- Diez B 148 e ff. 170–1: a collation of a 'fragmentum Ovidianum de Ponto, Societatis Jesu Lovaniensis satis antiquum. incipiebat fragmentum lib. III el. III v. 25'. The fragment broke off at 4. 4. 16; readings include 3. 3. 37 *studio* vel *stultus*, 43 *sumpsit* vel *cepit*, 3. 4. 18 *scripta* vel *visa*, 4. 1. 12 *lingua* vel *dextra*. Cf. Korn, ed. of *Ex Ponto* p. XXVIII.
- ib. ff. 271–95: 'Ovidius de Tristibus ... collatus cum codice MS°. Seguieri cancellarii Galliae' by Sam. Tennulius; the manuscript is now Mus. Brit. Harl. 2699 (surmised by Owen, ed. maior p. xxxii, and checked by me).
- ib. ff. 315–7: a collation of *Her.* 15 by Hoogstratanus (1718), with the note 'Exstabat haec epistola in priore codice Tibulli Wittiano. Inde Broukhusius conlegit varietatem lectionis. Codex ipse erat in membrana scriptus, notae adm. bonae'. This manuscript, Burman's Wittianus, is no. 17 in Dörrie's edition, Bodl. d'Orville 166; in Tibullus it is Broukhusius's A.
- ib. ff. 324–35: a collation by Hieronymus Stettlerus (1718) of Bernensis 478.
- ib. ff. 322–3, 336–9: collations of Bern. 505 and 512.
- ib. ff. 340–55: Heinsius's collation of Francofurtanus Barth. 110.
- ib. ff. 389–426: a collation by Medonius of the 'codex Tolosanus' described by Merkel, ed. of *Fasti* p. CCLXXXII<sup>142</sup>); the manuscript is now Berol. Phillippicus 1796.
- Diez 8° 2644 (ed. Amst. 1652): collations of a manuscript identifiable with Vind. 207 (Munari *Catalogue* no. 379) and of Monac. 594 and 384.
- Diez 8° 2647 (ed. Amst. 1661): a collation by Burman of a 'codex Balthas. Huydecoperi' containing *A.A.* and *Rem.*,

edition, read e.g. 1. 7 *edita*, 25 *sic erit et*, 67 *secreta*, 309 *numerabimus*. The manuscripts of *Tristia*, reported in Merkel's edition, read e.g. 1. 3. 77 *luctusque*, 1. 4. 15 *trahit*, 2. 20 *dabit*.

<sup>142</sup> Merkel gives the extent of the collation, and 2. 33–532 is a misprint for 5. 33–532.

also collated in Diez 8° 2653 (ed. Amst. 1658) by Vlaminius; the manuscript may now be Bodl. d'Orville 169 (S. C. 17047).

Diez 8° 2649 (ed. Amst. 1661): a collation by Burman of a 'codex Dorvillianus' containing *Fasti*, now Bodl. d'Orville 172 (S. C. 17050).

Exeter College, Oxford

M. D. Reeve

## EIN SINGHALESISCHER PRINZ IN ROM

(Beobachtungen zu Plinius, n.h. 6, 81–91)

Gustavo Simchen  
nonagenario

Seit Eudoxos von Kyzikos gegen Ende des 2. Jh. v. Chr. wohl schon unter Ausnutzung des Monsuns zu Schiff nach Indien gekommen war (Strab. 2. 3, 4 C 98f.) und Hippalos um die Zeitwende diese Reiseroute durch weitere Entdeckungen und Erfahrungen bestätigt hatte (Peripl. m. r. 57 [GGM 1, 298], Plin. n.h. 6, 100), war der Weg für einen allmählich wachsenden Südindienverkehr frei geworden<sup>1</sup>). Die indischen Gesandtschaften, die im Interesse politischer Koexistenz und kommerzieller Verträge aufgebrochen und von Augustus (Strab. 15. 1, 4, 73 C 686, 719, Dio Cass. 9, 58)<sup>2</sup>) an immer wieder Roms Machthaber besucht hatten, trugen gewiß auch dazu bei, daß sich neben einem stärkeren Engagement am wirtschaftlichen Kontakt mit Indien auch der Wunsch steigerte, Land und Leute im märchenumrankten Osten näher kennenzulernen.

Es ist demnach nicht befremdend, daß der ältere Plinius verhältnismäßig ausführlich auf Ceylon zu sprechen kommt. Zuerst referiert er kurz die diesbezüglichen Nachrichten seiner literarischen Vorgänger (6, 81–83). Die frühesten Auskünfte über Taprobane (skt. Tāmraparṇi, Pāli: Tambapārṇi)<sup>3</sup>) liefert nach

1) Vgl. R. Delbrueck, Südasiatische Seefahrt im Altertum, BJbb 155/156, 1955/56, 8–58, 229–308.

2) Vgl. R. C. Majumdar, The Classical Accounts of India, Calcutta 1960, 474–83.

3) Ursprünglich war damit nur ein Teilgebiet der Insel gemeint (vgl. Mahāvamsa VI 47).