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 Merkle, who discovered some of his material in Berlin; but unfortunately Merkle’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 Bodleian¹). 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 manuscripts²). 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.
and xxix (1957) 98–114\(^3\), 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\(^4\), 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\(^5\) or even twice over\(^6\), 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\(^7\).

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


\(^5\) 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.


\(^7\) 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 Davidson 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. Wittek 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. 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. Symbols like C and F stand for C in Bodl. Auct. S 5 7 and F in Berol. Diez 4° 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° 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° 1068 + 1076
1644 (Belgium): Diez B 148 e, Bodl. Auct. S 5 2
1645–6 (Paris): Diez 4° 1071 + 1070
1646–8, 1650 (Italy, Copenhagen): Auct. S 5 10 + 12

(b) of Metamorphoses
1641 (England): Diez 4° 1072
Heroides  

Diez 4° 1068

E. codex V.C.Petri Scrivelli, omnium vetustissimus, quos vidi [adscr. recentior est], ante annos quadringenitos litera exigua scriptus [adscr. tamen notae non optimae]  

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

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 25, 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 Mentelian of Metamorphoses (C8 and D8), the Combianus (B3 of Nux etc.), and, except in Med., the unidentified codex Mediolani emptus (A7 of Heroides 15 etc.).

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

J7 and K7 were identified by Dörrie, Untersuchungen zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Ovids Epistulae Heroidum (Nachr. Gött. 1960) II 408, 401, with Laur. Strozzi. 122 and Basil. F iv 17. N19, 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 iv (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 re dé deæ. Distinctive readings include 2. 71 falsique, 3. 113 te flere, 4. 39 corru, 7. 23 ficta, 48 vitas.

Heinsius's Manuscripts of Ovid

Diez 4° 1071
C. codex Regius in charta scriptus = Paris. Lat. 8243 (readings)¹³)
E. codex Gronovianus ante 400 annos scriptus = Leid. Bibl. Publ. 163 (catalogue¹⁴))
G. codex meus chartaceus = Diez B Sant. 8 (readings)
H. codex membraneus 500 circiter annorum Societatis Jesu Lovaniensis = Bruxell. 21 368¹⁵)
I. codex chartaceus anno MCCCLLI scriptus eiusdem Societatis = Bruxell. 4429 (catalogue¹⁶))
L. alter membraneus eiusdem Moreti = Antwerp. Plant. 141 (readings)

Auct. S 5 10
G. cod. S. Johan. in Viridario Patavin. 400 annorum¹⁸)

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 manuscipti III (Leyden 1912) p. 84. A collation of the manuscript was published by L. A. J. Burgersdijk, De tribus Ovidii Heroidum codicibus Leidensis (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. cxv (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 21 368, 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 ecidit, 16. 161 foret (all hopelessly unmetrical), 5. 23
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H. cod. Franciscanorum Patavin. eiusdem aetatis, sed mendozus
I. cod. Ambrosian. eiusdem aetatis, 500 ann. = I 8 inf. (readings 19)

L. codex bibl. Hafniensis 500 annorum = codex Bibl. Univ.
Hafniensis anno 1728 incendio absuntus 20
M. Arondelianus chartaceus = Edinburg. Bibl. Nat. (quondam
Bibl. Advocat.) 18. 2. 9 21

conscia, 7. 45 quod tu mediteris, 8. 79 fixa, 18. 180 clamas (for lacrimas),
19. 44 lampade iam pingui tinge, 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 erit1, quicquid id est2, 85 at socii me movere1,
at munera me movere2, 124 ad1, et2, 10. 29 unde1, inde2, 63 secundos2 (? erased,
11. 122 sed2, nec3, 17. 47 falsa1, falsa2, 18. 135 iterate1, iterate2. 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 cedit 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
invariably right, e.g. in Ep. 6 alone 7 quo licet cod. et Heins., quamlibet
Dörrie, 85 curr1 cod. et Heins., curs1 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
Kjobenhavn (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 Kjobenhavns Universitetsbibliothek
for 1728, iser dets Håndskriftsamlinger (1882), are two that look like Hein-
sius’s Hafnienses: ‘Ovidius in membrana’ (p. 160) = L10 of Heroides etc.,
and ‘Ovidius de Ponto’ (p. 93) = F12 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,
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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 Nor­folciana (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 1646 when he bought the Pirckheimer 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° 2586, are the source of CP. In 1639 Gronovius wrote to Heinsius from London as folio.ws: ‘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 (A7°) and briefly inspected another of Met. (C7°). The Pirckheimerianus 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 Pirckheimerianus. 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.
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a. fragmentum Farnesianum ultimarum epistularum, 500 annorum

H. codex meus a Medonio mihi donatus 400 ann. = Bodl. Rawl. G 100 S. C. 14826 (readings)
M. 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)


Heroides 15

Diez 4° 1074
Usi etiam sumus cod. chartaceo huius epistolae, quem Gronovii nostri beneficio habuimus, CG = F 68

Diez 4° 1068
F. codex chartaceus quondam Abrahami Merani = Wratislav. Magd. 1385 25)

Diez 4° 1071
A. codex Regiae bibliothecae conjunctus cum reliquis Epistolis chartaceus = C 71 of Heroides 26)

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 148 e 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.
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Auct. S 5 10
A. B. C. D. E. codices sunt Medicei, recentioris omnes notae =
Laur. 36. 2, 36. 23, 34. 26, 36. 21, 39. 25
G. codex Arundelianus chartaceus = M of Heroides

Auct. S 5 7
A. codex meus chartaceus Mediolani emptus, in quo et Amores
B. Vaticanus no. 1595
C. Farnes. chart. = F of Heroides
D. codex Reginae chartaceus, quem a Georgio Turriano
accept = 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. Maracci.

Other manuscripts of Heroides 15 ignored by Dörrie are Mus. Brit.
Harl. 2555, 2599, 2695, and 3716, Holkham Hall 359, 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 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 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 manus­
script S. Johannis in Viridario containing Heroides alone without 15 (G)
and a manuscript S. Antonii containing, as Heinsius says, A.A. (D), Rem. (C),
Heroides 15 (F), Nux (D), and Med. (C). One sign that Heinsius was in
some confusion over Paduan manuscripts is that he gives two incompatible
Patavii in charta’.

Fortunately it is possible to go further than supposition. At lines 7
and 33 a-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 Mardana by J o. 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 = O7 of Heroides
P. codex quem a Langermanno accepi = Bodl. Auct. F 1 18/Sc. C. 8857

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

Amores

Diez 4° 1068
B. codex Scriverianus chartaceus = Guelf. Extrav. 264. 12

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
C. D. sunt codices ab Angelo Politiano collati, prior quidem
S. Marci alter Mediceus. neuter iam ibi extat
H. Arondelianus chartaceus = M10 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 'i 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).


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. Line. VI xiii (1937) 320–70; see also Munari, S.I.F.C. xxiii (1949) 141–3. F12 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 Hafniensis 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\textsuperscript{16} of Heroides.

Auct. S 5 7
C. codex chartaceus Mediolani a me emptus = A\textsuperscript{7} of Heroides 15

I. 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, 45 coerce, 50 pone, 1. 5. 1 umbram

Amores 3. 5

Diez 4\textdegree 1068
C. codex Palatinus secundus qui inserit lib. III Amorum, inquit Gebhardus, ut ordine sit octava elegia = Vat. Pal. 1655\textsuperscript{36})
D. MS. Palatinus, quem Gruterus contulerat, incertum an idem cum eo quem Gebhardus tertium vocat = Vat. Pal. 910\textsuperscript{37})

Auct. S 5 10
A. D.\textsuperscript{38}) F. G. H. of Amores
a. ascriptum codici chartaceo Patavino de arte Amandi = F\textsuperscript{10} of Heroides 15\textsuperscript{39})

---

\textsuperscript{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’.\textsuperscript{37}) Gebhardus’s description of his manuscripts in Auct. S 5 6 removes the uncertainty: ‘contuli Amorum libros III cum duobus MSS. membranacei Biblioth. Pal. et uno cartaceo quem ex Gruteri exemplari exscripsi vocaturque 3t.’ See also n. 41.\textsuperscript{38}) D is cited for 13 vel alpentibus 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.\textsuperscript{39}) The same manuscript, designated by the same letter, is also cited for 2. 6 and 2. 15.
alter Ambros. bibl. cited for 34 \textit{executiens} \begin{align*}
\text{chart. Ambr. bibl. cited for 40 \textit{prona}}
\end{align*}
\begin{align*}
\Rightarrow H 225 \text{ inf.}^{40})
\end{align*}

Auct. S 5 7

A. E. G. of \textit{Amores}

\text{a. Vatic. no. 3149, cum libris de Ponto}

\textit{Ars Amatoria}

Diez 4° 1068

D. primus MS. Palatinus = G\textsuperscript{68} of \textit{Heroides}

E. secundus MS. Palatinus = H\textsuperscript{68} of \textit{Heroides}

F. tertius Palatinus a Gruteru collatus = D\textsuperscript{68} of \textit{Amores} 3. 5

G. quartus Palatinus, quem Pal. Gruterus vocat = Vat. Pal. 1662 \textsuperscript{41})

\begin{itemize}
\item[40]) If Heinsius took both readings from H 225 inf., 'alter' is obscure, since no Ambrosianus is cited for the rest of \textit{Amores}. The explanation may be that he had consulted O 23 sup. (1. 4. 1 \textit{nobis epulas 'cod. Ambros. quem inspexi'}, and similarly at 1. 14. 8 for \textit{fingit opus}). This latter, which contains 3. 5, seems to me to have \textit{exercens} in 34, but Dr. A. Paredi has confirmed my suspicion that it could be read as \textit{executiens} (or \textit{exoriens}). Nevertheless, since both \textit{executiens} and \textit{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.
\item[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 praetera 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.
\end{itemize}

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 ca 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.
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Diez 4° 1071

B. codex Regius ante annos octingentos scriptus venerandae antiquitatis = Paris. Lat. 7311

C. codex eiusdem bibliothecae satis mendose descriptus anno MCCCV, ut in fine legebatur = Paris. Lat. 7998 (catalogue)


E. codex chartaceus quem Angelus Aprosius dono dedit = Diez B Sant. 15 (readings)


G. cod. Ambrosianus scriptus ante 500 annos = I10 of Heroides

H. cod. eiusdem biblioth. recentior = F 76 sup. (readings)

I. alter codex meus chartaceus = G71 of Heroides

Auct. S 5 10

A. (not in the list) = Laur. 36. 2

B. cod. chartaceus S. Antonii Patavii cui et Remedium Amoris et Sapphus epistula et Nux et Medicamen Faciei accedit = F10 of Heroides

E. cod. Episcopi Tomasini ante annos 300 scriptus aut plures in membr.


G. cod. Ambrosianus scriptus ante 500 annos = I10 of Heroides

H. cod. eiusdem biblioth. recentior = F 76 sup. (readings)

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) A10 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 = H71
K. codex chartaceus Bartholi Bartholini48)
L. codex Hafniensis bibliothecae 500 ann. = L10 of Heroides
M. codex chartaceus Arondel. = M10 of Heroides

Auct. S 5 7
N. Argentinensis bibliothecae chartaceus = codex anno 1870 incendio absumptus49)
P. cod. Bernhardi Rottendorphii, 400 annorum = Guelf. Gud. Lat. 313/4620 (readings)51)


Remedia Amoris

Diez 4° 1068
B. codex bibliothecae Bodleianae Oxoniensis etiam recens in membrana tamen scriptus = Auct. F 5 6/S.C. 2195 (readings)

Diez 4° 1071
L. codex meus chartaceus = H71 of A.A.
M. alter codex meus chartaceus = G71 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 General des Bibliotheques Publiees de France: Departements XLVII (1923) 1.
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\textsuperscript{10} of Heroides 15
D. cod. chart. Patavii alter Hectoris Trevisani = D\textsuperscript{10} of Med.
E. codex Bartholi Bartholini chartaceus = K\textsuperscript{10} of A. A.
F. codex 500 annorum Hafniensis bibliothecae = L\textsuperscript{10} of Heroides
G. codex Zulichemianus 400 annorum = K\textsuperscript{12} of Tristia
H. codex chart. Arondel. = M\textsuperscript{10} 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\textsuperscript{7} of Heroides 15
F. codex Farnesian. chartaceus = C\textsuperscript{7} of Heroides 15
M. Reginae codex chartaceus, quem illi donavit V. C. Georgius Turrianus medicus Patavinus = D\textsuperscript{7} of Heroides 15
N. cod. Argentoratensis bibliothecae chartaceus = N\textsuperscript{7} of A. A.?
O. codex quem Vossius dedit, 300 annorum = M\textsuperscript{7} of Heroides?


Medicamina Faciei

Diez 4° 1068
A. codex Palatinus a Grutero collatus = D\textsuperscript{68} of Amores 3. 5
B. alter cod. Palatinus ab eodem collat. = G\textsuperscript{68} of A. A.\textsuperscript{52})

Auct. S 5 10
C. cod. Patavin. chartaceus S. Antonii = F\textsuperscript{10} of Heroides 15\textsuperscript{53)}

\textsuperscript{52}) Cf. n. 41.
\textsuperscript{53}) The text of Med. in Bodl. Canon. Class. Lat. 19 is very close to that of C.
\textsuperscript{54}) The manuscript is V\textsubscript{2} 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 = K10 of A.A.

Auct. S 5 7
B. codex alter meus chart. Mediolani emptus = A7 of Heroides 15?


Nux

Diez 4° 1068
C. codex Palatinus, quem Gruterus contulerat = D88 of Amores 3.

Diez 4° 1071
C. codex Jesuitarum Lovanii chartaceus = I71 of Heroides

Auct. S 5 10
F. cod. chart. Thomae Bartholini56)

Auct. S 5 7
B. codex Venetiis a Combio mihi donatus = Bodl. Douce 146/S. C. 21720 (readings)57)

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. Ruysschaert in vol. 1 of the Supplement to
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F. codex Erfortanus Fastis annexus 600 annorum = Gött. Phil. 127 (catalogue 58)

10 argolicae, 100 habes, 158 levatur

Metamorphoses 59

Diez 4° 1069

I. 2. 3. CB = EFG 72
CG = H 72
CV = D 72

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 obdata (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 11 = Marc. 225 are scattered about the earlier books, and from 9. 461 to the end readings that I judge to be from L 8 = 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 celererrime, 956 mibi, 14. 273 costi, 558 imago, 844 aspectasse, 15. 150 animos, 230 rapidarium). All these readings are reported in Auct. S. 5 11 by Heinsius, who surmises that the former group come from A 11 (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 redit 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 redit with hesit above. If the source of redit was anything more solid than Politian's memory, it was certainly not L 8, 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

B. codex Collegii Balliolensis Oxoniae eiusdem fere aetatis cum superiori sed literis admodum minutis scriptus. codex hic erat mutitus et incipiebat lib. IV 117

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

D. codex Vossianus ante trecentos ferme annos scriptus = Leid. Voss. Q 61

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

Diez 4° 1075

C. codex Thuani ante quadringentos annos scriptus = Paris. Lat. 8253

D. alter codex Thuani, non valde antiquus

E. codex Regius tertius recens = Paris. Lat. 8017

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.
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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
E. codex meus quem Mediolani comparavi, 400 = Diez B Sant.
13 (readings)
F. codex Reginae, 500 = Guelf. Gud. Lat. 159/4463
(readings)
H. cod. chart. Const. Lempereurii
a. excerpta codicis cum quo Colinaei editio erat collata, quam
Langermannus mihi donavit = Bodl. 8° D 218 Linc.

Auct. S 8
A. codex tertius v. cl. Johannis Frederid Gronovii ante CCC
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
C. codex meus quem Johannes Mentelius medicus Parisiensis
mihi donavit = Paris. Lat. 8006 (catalogue)

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 w8 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. Lugudunensis 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.

For Constantinus l’Empereur, professor of Hebrew at Leyden, see

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

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

disregarded 1. 84–166, which are partially preserved on f. 9.

72) Munari, Catalogue no. 245. C and D are two of the four Mentelianimi
given to Heinsius in 1651 (Syll. II 285), and the other two are A7 and B7
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 73
M. litera notata sunt ex codice Vaticano excerpta Parmensis editionis, quem Matthaeus Herculanus passim emendarat 74
O. excerpta ex Aldino codice M. Mureti quem cum MSS. duobus contulerat etc. 76
P. fragmentum apud Patres Oratorios Romae sescentorum annorum ex variis Metamorphoseon libris 77

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 10 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 levius, 190 vehnus 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 quaquam, 7. 621 pignore pignus, 15. 819 natusque simul, 866 celsus.

77) Slater gives the symbol for this fragment as Φ, P, but the Φ 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.


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 80)

i. *codex 500 annorum, quem Langermannus dono mihi dedit = Guelf. Aug. 13. 9 4°/3034 81)

o. *p. quartus et quintus Basileenses, chartacei = Basil. F vi 12, F iii 7 (readings 82)

q. *codex Argentinensis bibliothecae 500 circiter annorum = codex anno 1870 incendio absumptus

r. *codex eiusdem bibliothecae chartaceus = sim. 83)


Auct. S 5 5

c. (not in the list) *fragmentum Caesenas 85)

---


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*3 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.

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) 86)
D. eiusdem codex scriptus ante annos CCCC
   a. fragmentum eiusdem scriptum ante annos D, in quo tres aut
      quatuor libri hic illic 87)
K. codex Bernardi Rottendorphii, 500 annorum = Guelf. Gud.
   Lat. t23/4427 88)
q. excerpta Francisci Jureti, quae vir ampliss. Philippus de la
   Mare mecum communicavit = Diez 8° 2541, from Divionensis 497
   89)
d. fragmentum Zulichemianum libri circiter unius, 500 annorum 90)
L. codex Constantini Hugenii Zulichemii, qui Plantini olim
   fuerat, 500 annorum 91)
O. codex Arondelianus, 500 annorum = Leid. Voss. O 51 92)
Q. (codex) Rogerii Twisden Baroneti, 400 annorum 93)

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 w6 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 comatum, 777 expelliet, 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
   r. 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).
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R. codex bibliothecae Noricae, 300 annorum = Norimb. Bibl. Civ. Cent. V 56 (readings)\(^ {94} \)
S. codex Joh. Georgii Graevii, 400 annorum\(^ {95} \)
I. excerpta ex codice Leodicensi S. Jacobi libri primi
m. excerpta ex codice Caroli Langii
n. fragmentum vetererrimum Leodicense unius folii initio lib. I.
has schedas mecum communicavit Val. Andreas = Diez B 148 e ff. 237-41\(^ {96} \)
o. lib. II et III ex codice Helmstadiensi, quem (?) Langermannus mecum communicavit\(^ {97} \)

Orba 3 edita prisco h, ib. 4 habebat h, 1. 18 nam H, 22 dissipat D, 24 evolvit B, 28 aer coelo A\(^ {72} \), 42 uberioris H, 46 quintaque A\(^ {72} \), 52 eminet Men., 57 habendi H, 69 decreverat a, 71 mundo B, 91 scisso A\(^ {72} \), fulvo S, 100 faciebant A\(^ {23} \), 105 horrentia H, 109 matura L, 110 candebant h, 112 sudabant L, 116 aeterni D, 118 divisit D, 125 et aenea A\(^ {72} \), 143 percutit a, 145 gloria A\(^ {23} \), 148 incurrit A\(^ {72} \) incurrit honores Men., 159 iacerent D, 168 declinis Men., 181 minis H, solvis A\(^ {23} \), 193 et nymphae et satyri Q, 196 en satis B, 212 de summo labor A\(^ {72} \), 258 proles obsessa A\(^ {72} \), 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\(^ {23} \), 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\(^ {23} \).

\(^ {96} \) 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 (numeri).

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 dissepsarat.

There is no trace of L in the Catalogue des Livres de la Bibliotheque de la celebre ex-abbaye de St Jacques à Liége (1788).

\(^ {97} \) I cannot find any citations from 0 either in books 2 and 3 or elsewhere in the work, and there is no manuscript of Met. among the Helmstadienses 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.
M. D. Reeve

denis A\textsuperscript{23}, 539 salut 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 gra-
viora B, 26 taciteque L, 34 extimuit ... palam A\textsuperscript{23}, 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\textsuperscript{23}, 105 conges-
t B, 107 patet D, 137 extis B, 177 constat A\textsuperscript{23}, 193 tollitur H, 219
districtae L, 249 regetit D, 794 placet S, 813 absissa D, 833 sciet Men., 836 sanctam prolem B, 839 servet H, 842 promus ab L, 844 ipsa venus A\textsuperscript{72}, 847 increscere A\textsuperscript{23}, 862 quirinus L, 864 secreta L, 870 factoantque H, 873 quae non nisi Men.

\textit{Fasti}\textsuperscript{98)}

Auct. S. 5 12

M. cod. chart. S. Johannis in Viridario Patavii\textsuperscript{99)}

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)\textsuperscript{100)}


\textit{Tristia}\textsuperscript{101)}

\textsuperscript{98)} References are to Bömer's text (Heidelberg 1957). The other 55 manuscripts of \textit{Fasti} used by Heinsius were identified by Alton: see Wormell, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{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. 153–210, and there may have been another omission between 3. 740 and 841.

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

\textsuperscript{101)} For \textit{Tristia} and \textit{Ex Ponto} references are to Owen's ed. minor (O.C.T., 1915). L\textsuperscript{9} of \textit{Tristia}, the Medonianus, was identified by Owen, ed. maior (Oxford 1889) xxx, with Bodl. Rawl. G 107.
Heinsius's Manuscripts of Ovid

Diez 4° 1073
CP. cod. Pirckheimerianus, cuius excerpta mihi misit Gronovius.
in eo haec argumenta singulis Elegiis praeponebantur = M[12102]

II. Palat. prior membranaceus, alter in charta, hac distincti
litera, A.B. = HI[70]
litera C. codex Bibl. Leidensis membranaceus notatur = B[76103]

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[104]

Diez 4° 1070
B. codex Puteaneus ante quadringentos annos scriptus = Paris.
Lat. 7993
C. codex alius Gallicus = Paris. Lat. 8239[105]
G. codex Lovaniensis Buslidianus, qui Petri Nannii[106] olim
fuerat = Lovan. Bibl. Univ. 18, anno 1914 incendio
absumptus[107]

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 of 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\textsuperscript{68} of *Heroides*
I. alter Palat. = D\textsuperscript{68} of *Amores* 3. 5 \textsuperscript{108}

Auct. S \textsuperscript{5 12}

C. codex Barberinorum ante annos 500 scriptus = Vat. Barb. Lat. 59 (catalogue\textsuperscript{109})
D. Ereritanorum Patavii = C\textsuperscript{12} of *Ex Ponto*
G. Hafniensis 500 annorum = L\textsuperscript{10} 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\textsuperscript{110})
H. cod. quem a Vossio habui, 400 annorum = G\textsuperscript{12} or H\textsuperscript{12} of *Ex Ponto?*
K. Zulichemianus 400 annorum = Leid. Bibl. Publ. Lips. 51 (catalogue\textsuperscript{111})
L. Rottendorphii 400 annor. = Guelf. Gud. Lat. 192/4496 (readings)\textsuperscript{112}
M. chartaceus Arondelianus = M\textsuperscript{10} of *Heroides*

Auct. S \textsuperscript{5 9}

A. codex Richelianus 400 annorum = Paris. Bibl. Genovevensis Y 1 3/2408\textsuperscript{113}
B. codex quem mihi dedit Combii librarii filius Venetiis = B\textsuperscript{7} of *Nux*
H. cod. Medic. 400 annor. = Laur. 36. 33
I. cod. Med. recens Laur. 36. 33 \textsuperscript{114}

\textsuperscript{108} Gebhardus’s collations, which were Heinsius's source for the readings of these two manuscripts, are preserved in Diez 8\textsuperscript{o} 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 \textsuperscript{5 6} (cf. Munari p. 113). In the second, Diez 8\textsuperscript{o} 2590, he collated four Palatini of *Met.*, of which the first is P\textsuperscript{7}.

\textsuperscript{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.
\textsuperscript{112} Cf. n. 51.
\textsuperscript{113} The manuscript is C in Owen’s ed. maior.
\textsuperscript{114} H can be identified from Owen’s ed. maior or simply from Bandini’s catalogue. 36. 2 is already familiar.
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K. codex Caroli Strozzae, 400 annorum = Laur. Strozz. 124 (catalogue \textsuperscript{115})

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

\textit{Ex Ponto} \textsuperscript{116}

Diez 4\textsuperscript{o} 1073

CP. codex Pircheimerianus, cuius excerpta beneficio Cl. Gronovii mei habeo = M\textsuperscript{12} \textsuperscript{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 = Vicentinus Bibl. Bertolianae 153 (catalogue \textsuperscript{118})

E. codex bibliothecae Hafniensis 500 annorum = L\textsuperscript{10} of \textit{Heroides}

F. alter eiusdem bibliothecae eadem aetate \textsuperscript{119}


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

M. chartaceus Arondelianus = M\textsuperscript{10} of \textit{Heroides}

a. fragmentum quod a Boxhornio habui, ante 300 annos scriptum, in quo tres priores libri = a\textsuperscript{12} of \textit{Tristia} \textsuperscript{120}

Auct. S 5 9

A. B. Thuanaci codices membr. 400 annorum = Paris. Lat. 8256, 8462 (readings \textsuperscript{121})

\textsuperscript{115} Cf. Wormell, \textit{op. cit.} (n. 2) 55, and vol. II of Bandini's \textit{Supplementum} (Florence 1792) col. 505.

\textsuperscript{116} K\textsuperscript{12} was identified by Korn, ed. of \textit{Ex Ponto} (Leipzig 1868) xxvi, with Guelf. Gud. Lat. 228/4533.

\textsuperscript{117} Cf. the last paragraph of n. 21.

\textsuperscript{118} Mazzatinti, \textit{Inventari dei Manoscrittii delle Biblioteche d'Italia} II (1892) p. 44.

\textsuperscript{119} Cf. n. 20.

\textsuperscript{120} The manuscript as described in the catalogue, \textit{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.

\textsuperscript{121} Among the readings in 8256 checked by Dr. Laffitte one did not correspond, 4. 3. 21 \textit{aut age die} 8256, \textit{die age nunc} A. For an interesting variant in this manuscript see \textit{C.Q.} (forthcoming).
C. codex meus, quem Venetiis a Combio habui = B7 of Nux
H. Farnesianus 500 annorum = Neapol. Bibl. Nat. IV F 17
(readings)
L. Mediceus 600 annor. = Laur. 36. 32
M. alter recens = Laur. 36. 2
N. tertius chartaceus Mediceus = Laur. 36. 30 122)
O. P. duo codices mei 400 annorum, a Medonio donati = Bodl.
   Rawl. G 106, 105/S. C. 14832, 14831 (readings) 123)

I. I. 41 turpe H, 53 hanc G, 1. 2. 16 sanguine tela H, 1. 3. 21
podalirius H, 56 cultaque G, 1. 4. 49 ergo dixi facerent G, 2. 1. 12
neget H, 21 vidi H, 2. 3. 1 imples G, 2. 4. 4 en partes ... mea 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 = A70

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. 124)
K. alter codex meus in charta = G71 of Heroides

Auct. S 5 12
A. B. C. D. codices sunt Medicei recentiores = Laur. 36. 2,
   36. 31, 36. 21, 33. 31 125)
H. cod. Patav. Heremitarum eodem anno scriptus .. 1468 =
   C12 of Ex Ponto

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 1936).
64 nunc matutino, 71 sidera cum radiis, 128 spemque ... alam, 168 indignum

Consolatio ad Liviam

Auct. S 5 12
A. cod. Mediceus = Laur. 36. 2 128)
B. prima editio quae penes me

Auct. S 5 9
A. codex Venetiis a Combio mihi datus in quo Tristia et Pontica = B7 of Nux 127)
B. codex scriptus 1493 quem Renerus Ansl0 128) Romae mecum communicavit = Vat. Lat. 1621 129)
C. codex v. c. Venet. 1474 cuius in margine multa manu viri docti notata erant, ex vteri codice, ut opinor. habui a Jo. Rhodio 130)
D. codex quem Langermannus mihi donavit in quo omnia Ovidii praeter Metamorphos. scriptus ante 200 annos = P7 of Heroides 15
E. veterrima editio
F. alia veterrima editio. neutri annus adscriptus
G. ed. Veneta 1486

Halieuticon

Auct. S 5 10

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 heii, 11 est, 24 coli est, 49 campoque foroque, 57 quod, 75 numina, 79 turba, 81 genitrice, 88 heii, 93 mortem, 95 et 1 at 2, 101 zephyris, 106 daunias, 111 olymneides, 176 heii, 185 vindice 1 indice, 223 amplexum, 379 quod es alte quod fontibus, 403 iunonis grais, 438 conix, 473 conix. It shares some of its spelling with H (beii, genitrice, conix).
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.
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 131)

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
of 1630 from the library of Is. Vossius containing similar
excerpta for part of Heroides 132. It was presumably from Grono-
vius’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 148 e 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. Trans-
misit ea ad me Fabricius a P. Puteano ea nactus 133). 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

131) For these two manuscripts see Richmond’s edition (London
1662) pp. 9, 6.
132) These excerpta were published by Burgersdijk, op. cit. (n. 14).
133) 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 Scaligeri134).

Excerpta Scaligeri

Boese found excerpta Scaligeri cited for Amores and A.A. in ff. 73–94 of Diez B 148e; Korn had already used Diez 4° 1076 for excerpta Scaligeri of Ex Ponto. The origin of all these excerpta is Diez 8° 2360, a copy of the ed. Gryph. of 1546135); it also contains marginal readings in Heroides (= MS74), 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. I. 5. 10 diffusa, 2. 5. 29 defers, A.A. I. 160 supposuisse). His source for Amores was a manuscript that read e.g. I. 4. 23 queraris, 48 superiecta, I. 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 (I. 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: I. 2. 33 transmutor136, 76 vix bene, 138 socias137, I. 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 did138).

---

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 538–9).

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

136) Perhaps transmitter; 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 *exeerpta 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 Exeerpta**

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 MD LXIV quas mecum communicavit Doctiss. Juvenis, GERARDUS VOSSIUS GER. PIL.’

The source of these *exeerpta* 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). 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.


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 *fugas monitis*, 139 *artes*, 146 *cassa*. The second manuscript of *Fasti*, which is no. 40 in Merkel's
Excerpta Douzae


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°. Segueri 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. 389–426: a collation by Medonius of the ‘codex Tolosanus’ described by Merkel, ed. of Fasti p. CCLXXXII142); 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 lucitusque, 1· 4· 15 trahit, 2· 20 dabit.

142) 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 Vlamin­
gius; 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).
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EIN SINGHALESISCHER PRINZ IN ROM
(Beobachtungen zu Plinius, n.h. 6, 81–91)

Gustavo Simchen
	onagennario

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 1). Die indischen Gesandtschaf­
ten, die im Interesse politischer Koexistenz und kommer­
zieller Verträge aufgebrochen und von Augustus (Strab. 15. 1, 4,
73 C 686, 719, Dio Cass. 9, 58)2) 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. Zu­
erst referiert er kurz die diesbezüglichen Nachrichten seiner lite­
rarischen Vorgänger (6, 81–83). Die frühesten Auskünfte über
Taprobane (skt. Tämraparṇi, Pāli: Tambapaṇṇi)3) 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
3) Ursprünglich war damit nur ein Teilgebiet der Insel gemeint (vgl.
Mahāvaṃśa VI 47).