

HEINSIUS'S MANUSCRIPTS OF OVID: A SUPPLEMENT

A second visit to Berlin has made necessary some corrections to my remarks in *Rh. Mus.* cxvii (1974) 162–5 on the *excerpta* used by Heinsius, and at the same time I can add further information about some of his other sources. I go through in order.

P. 133: I should perhaps have drawn together what can be said about the history of the manuscripts and books in Berlin and Oxford that belonged to Heinsius. The history of those in Oxford is straightforward: they were bought at the auction in 1683 by Ed. Bernard, Savilian Professor of Astronomy, and sold to the Bodleian by his widow after his death in 1697. Cf. Tho. Smith, *Vita clarissimi et doctissimi viri Edwardi Bernardi* (London 1704) 42–3, and Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* IV (ed. Bliss, London 1820) 707–10. Those that were left by H. F. Diez in 1817 to the Royal Library in Berlin (now the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek) had not all been together since 1683, and their history, when it is not revealed by signatures of ownership, must be traced through the auction catalogues of Santen (Leyden 1800), the younger Burman (Leyden 1779), Joh. de Witt (Amsterdam 1736 and Dordrecht 1701), Broukhusius (Amsterdam 1708), Francius (Amsterdam 1705), and others (the signature of Hadr. Relandus, for instance, appears in some of the manuscripts, but I have not seen an auction catalogue of his library). Santen certainly owned all of them, and probably Burman before him (a laborious comparison of the two catalogues with *Bibliotheca Heinsiana* would decide), but no-one else. From the library of Joh. de Witt some of Heinsius's manuscripts also reached the Bodleian: at least one from the catalogue of 1701 is in the Rawlinson collection (Tho. Rawlinson visited the continent in 1705)¹, and at least

1) Rawl. G 105 (P^o of *Pont.*) = libri mss. in quarto no. 36. Other possibilities are Rawl. G 106 + 107 (O^o of *Pont.* + L^o of *Trist.*) = *ibid.* 35, Rawl. G 101 (F⁷⁰ of *Trist.* + E⁷⁰ of *Pont.*) = *ibid.* 37, and Rawl. G 102 = *ibid.* 38 (cf. p. 152 n. 72). Perhaps too Rawl. G 100 = *ibid.* 33, the second manuscript of *Her.* that allegedly came ex *Bibliotheca Menteliana*; for Hein-

three from the catalogue of 1736²) were bought by d'Orville (cf. Bodl. d'Orville 302, a catalogue of his manuscripts drawn up by Strackhovius in which provenances are recorded).

Volumes lent to Heinsius by Gronovius and now in the Diez collection were bought by Santen from the library of Abr. Gronovius, for which see the auction catalogue (Leyden 1785). P. 134 n. 4: I have been asked why I did not mention Lenz's second article on the subject, *Eranos* lxi (1963) 98–120. The answer is that it offers nothing new except mistakes.

P. 136: On B⁶⁸ and the other codices Episcopi Lincolnensis collated in the same volume see *Maia* xxv (1973) 115–6, especially 116 n. 5.

E⁶⁸ and the identified Scriverianus, F⁶⁸, can be found in *Libri appendiciarii Bibliothecae Scriverianae* (Amsterdam 1663): the latter is no. 112, the former no. 135 'Ovidii Heroidum fragmentum'.

P. 137: L⁷¹ of *Her.* had not lost 8. 106–9. 133 when Heinsius collated it.

P. 139 n. 21: Dr Cunningham's description of the Arondelianus has appeared in *Scriptorium* xxvii (1973) 67–9.

P. 141 n. 27: More manuscripts of *Her.* 15 not mentioned in Dörrie's edition of *Her.* are Ferr. Civ. II 156, Laur. Aed. 203, Ambros. H 23 sup., Y 99 sup., Trivult. N 774, Parm. 283, Sen. H VI 21, H VI 30, I IX 1, Vat. Lat. 3595, Harv. Lat. 42. I have brought these and the others to Professor Dörrie's attention, and he tells me that he will take account of as many as he can in his forthcoming commentary on *Her.* 15.

P. 142 n. 31: The Langermannianus was first identified, at any rate in *Cons.*, by H. Oldecop, *de Consolatione ad Liviam* (Göttingen 1911) 29–31.

P. 143 n. 38: Though the ed. Parmensis does not contain *Amores* 3.5, the Marcianus did, and Politian copied out its text. The reason why no-one has known this is that Auct. P 2 2 has lost the leaf in question. A copy survives, however, at the end of

sius never received more than one manuscript of *Her.* alone from that source (cf. p. 152 n. 72), and confusion is conceivable between Mentelius and the Montalbensis who once owned Rawl. G 100 (on whom see *Syll.* V 613, 614, 625). The only one of Rawl. G 100–8 that Heinsius did not own is 104; how Tho. Rawlinson came by 103 (G²⁵ of *Met.*) and 108 (F⁷¹ of *A.A.*) I have not discovered.

2) I am indebted to Dr Ursula Winter for information about entries in this catalogue, which is not in either the Bodleian or the British Museum.

Puccio's transcript, Monac. libri cum nott. mss. in fol. 35 (ed. Ven. 1489). As the Marcianus stopped at 28, after which Puccio writes 'hactenus repperi in Ovidiano vetusto codice in Divi Marci bibliotheca Florentiae: Politianus', the case for treating as copies Laur. 91 sup. 25 and Paris. Ars. 898, which also stop at 28, becomes even stronger; cf. Lenz, *Rend. Acc. Linc.* VI xiii (1937) 320-65³), and Munari, *S.I.F.C.* xxiii (1948) 141-3.

Here, from a microfilm kindly supplied by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, is a collation of Puccio's transcript against Kenney's text: tit. *de somno*, 1 *laxos*, 2 *terruerant*, 3 *celeberrimus*, 5 *graminea*, nitidissima, 11 *tunc*, 14 *siccata*, 19 *ausus*, 20 *terrae*, 21 *pennis coniuix* (ut vid.), 24 *comas*.

My remarks about D¹⁰ are otherwise unaffected.

P. 145 n. 41: In *Met.* Gruterus's three Palatini, oddly called primus, secundus, and quartus, are 1663, 1664, 1667. When Heinsius wrote on 1664 'MS. III vocatus Grutero' (Munari, *Catalogue* no. 363), 'Grutero' must have been a slip for 'Gebhardo' (cf. below on p. 158 n. 108). Gruterus's manuscript 'D. Boschii', which ended at 15. 714, is now Vindob. 2882 (Munari, *Catalogue* no. 381); Dr Mazal has kindly checked a few readings.

P. 146 n. 51: The identification turned out to have been made not only by Kenney but also by P. Lehmann on p. 177 of an interesting article about Bernhard Rottendorff to which Mr Kenney refers me, *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* xxviii (1938) 163-90; Lehmann also identified the Rottendorphiani of *Met.* (p. 174) and *Trist.* (pp. 180-1, tentatively). Rottendorff acquired the manuscript of *Trist.* early in 1658 at Cologne and had sent it to Heinsius by May (*Syll.* V 264); the others he acquired in 1651 (Lehmann pp. 174, 176, 177) and sent to Heinsius early in 1657 (*Syll.* V 263).

P. 149 n. 59: If Politian's memory was the immediate source of *seddit* at *Met.* 15. 162 *haesit in adverso*, the ultimate source may have been *Ibis* 223 *seddit in adverso*.

P. 150 n. 64: D⁷⁵ of *Met.* is Paris. Lat. 8008. The mistake was not Munari's but Heinsius's: the readings that Munari found cited in Heinsius's commentary from the alter Thuaenaeus are all assigned in Diez 4⁰ 1075 to C.

P. 152 n. 74: M⁸ of *Met.* was owned by Fulvio Orsini; see P. de Nolhac, *la Bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris 1887) 176, 383 no.

3) He should have made up his mind whether Laur. 91 sup. 25 contains 3.5 or not (pp. 324, 351).

18. The edition was printed neither at Parma, as Heinsius supposed, nor at Florence, as Nolhac supposed, but at Venice, though the colophons do not say so. 'Heinsius a *Matheo Capcasa Parmense* in errorem inductus est', as J.C. Jahn pointed out in *de P. Ovidii Nasonis et A. Sabini epistolis* (Leipzig 1826) 30 n. 2, and Nolhac was similarly misled by 'Lucantonii Florentini impensa'. Cf. the *British Museum Catalogue of XVth century Books V* (London 1924) 597-8.

P. 152 n. 77: *C.Q.* will shortly publish a note in which Professor W. S. Anderson, who is preparing an edition of *Met.*, identifies the fragmentum Theatinum with Vallicell. F 25, loosely described by Munari in his second supplement (cf. p. 149 n. 59), p. 280. P. 153 n. 80: *C.Q.* lxviii (1974) 116-7. I neglected to acknowledge in n. 2 on p. 117 my debt to Dr Eva Ziesche of the Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz, the present home of the Plautine fragment (Lat. qu. 784), who put me on the track of Norden's article.

P. 154: B²³ of *Met.* gave out at 15. 847.

P. 155: On Graevius's manuscripts, most of which are now Harleiani in the British Museum, see A.C. Clark, *C.R.* v (1891) 365-72. The *Catalogus Bibliothecae Graevianae* mentions three manuscripts of *Met.*, no. 22 'Metamorphosis Ovidii cum Glossis, in pergameno', no. 28 'Metamorphosis Ovidii, in pergameno', and no. 54 'Fragmenta Ciceronis de Officiis - Ovidii Metamorph. - et Euclidis Geometrica'; the second or third of these is presumably Harl. 2610 (Munari, *Catalogue* no. 166). S²³, however, is not among the Harleiani; perhaps it was no longer in Graevius's possession when he died in 1703. Heinsius saw it in 1661; he received it before February 13th and had deposited it with Gronovius by April 21st (Bodl. d'Orville 472 ff. 21, 23).

P. 156: Mr Courtney, who is investigating all the manuscripts of *Fasti* towards an edition, kindly tells me that he has identified N¹² with Berol. Hamiltonensis 473. I did not examine this manuscript on either of my visits to Berlin, supposing through a mistaken recollection of *Hermathena* xlv (1930) 371 that Alton had exhausted the Berolinenses of *Fasti*.

P. 157 n. 104: More correctly, what followed the fragmentum Revianum at an interval was *Nux* 7-9, 23-5, 27-32, 41-4, 55-6, 87-8, *Amores* 3. 5. 1-2, 9-10, 43-4, and *Ibis* 113-7, 120, 123-4.

A coincidence has thrown new light on its later history. Mr B.C. Barker-Benfield has been trying to trace a copy of *Tristia* that formed part of a manuscript in the library of Queen

Christina of Sweden. The contents of the manuscript are given in an unpublished catalogue, Vat. Lat. 8171, compiled at Antwerp in 1655, and again in Montfaucon's *Bibliotheca* (Paris 1739) I 53 no. 1732; Montfaucon drew on Paris. Lat. 13076 ff. 7-223, a version of a catalogue compiled in the 1680s at Rome. All the other parts of the manuscript have been identified among the Reginenses in the Vatican: the Ovidian excerpts, for instance, are now in 2120, and the rest of it is divided among 1587, 1561, and 54. On f. 1 of 1587, which was also f. 1 of the original manuscript, occur the inscriptions 'ex libb. Petri Danielis Aurelii 1560' and 'nunc Nicolai Heinsii'; 1561, which on f. 100 bears the similar inscription 'ex libris Petri Danielis Aurelii 1561', contains a text of Vibius Sequester identifiable with that collated by Heinsius in Leid. Burm. Q 13 (Geel no. 596) from a manuscript belonging to Jacobus Revius. It appears, therefore, that the manuscript described in the two catalogues of the Queen's library is identical with the one given by Revius to Heinsius, who certainly made contributions to the Queen's library (*Syll.* III 244). Revius may have acquired it at Daniel's home town Orléans, where he spent the years 1610-2: see his own *Daventria Illustrata* (Leyden 1651) 726-7. As the fragment of *Tristia* still formed part of it in the 1680s, it ought to be somewhere among the Reginenses or the Ottoboniani today. For further details see D. M. Robathan, *C. Phil.* xxxiii (1938) 188-97; J. Bignami Odier, *Studi e Testi* ccxix (1962) 159-89; J. Sparrow, *The Library* ser. 5 xvii (1962) 297-304; F. de Marco, *Studi e Testi* ccxxxviii (1964) no. 1732; R. Gelsomino, ed. of Vibius Sequester (Teubner, Leipzig 1967) xx-xxi. I am indebted to Mr Barker-Benfield for much of this information.

On Jacobus Revius, besides pp. 725-7 of *Daventria Illustrata*, see E. J. W. Posthumus Meyjes, *Jacobus Revius, zyn Leven en Werken* (Amsterdam 1895).

P. 158 n. 108: Gebhardus's five Palatini of *Met.* (not four) are in order 1661, 1663, 1664, 1667, 1670. Cf. also above on p. 145 n. 41.

P. 158: E¹² of *Trist.*, 'nescio qualis sit codex. puto a Petro Servio mihi donatum', remains to be identified, because Heinsius's guess was wrong; at any rate, the manuscript is not the same as F⁷⁰, 'codex meus quem a Petro Servio dono accepi', which is Bodl. Rawl. G 101. The sequence of symbols suggests that he collated it between October 1647, when he arrived in Padua (*Syll.* III 191), and whenever he collated the Gottorpiani (late in 1650?

cf. *ibid.* 590–1). It gave out at 5. 13. 21 and read e.g. 1. 2. 25 *frigore*, 28 *tempore*, 43 *quamvis*.

P. 159: M⁹ and N⁹ of *Trist.*, the two Bononienses, were tentatively but correctly identified by Munari, 105 n. 4, with Bonon. 1301 (2527) and 1346 (2584); Dr Diego Maltese has kindly checked a few readings in both. Confirmation was necessary because in Luck's edition (Heidelberg 1967) more than one reading of 1301 is assigned to 1346 (2. 17 *scilicet et*, 3. 10. 30 *tacitis*). Dr Maltese assures me that at 1. 3. 75 the reading *Metius*, which Heinsius cites from M (and B), is not in either M or N⁴).

P. 159 n. 121: *C.Q.* lxviii (1974) 117.

P. 160: The Petaviani have a complicated history, and there is no telling where C⁷⁰ of *Ibis* may turn up. If it still exists, La Penna's thorough researches into the manuscripts of *Ibis* might have been expected to bring it to light, but if he could miss an Ottobonianus (*Scholia in Ibin* pp. 209–10), not all hope is lost.

Most of Alexander Petavius's manuscripts were bought by Is. Vossius for Queen Christina in 1650 and conveyed to Sweden; the fullest catalogue of earlier date is Leid. Voss. Q 76, but another drawn up in 1645, of which the original may be Paris. Lat. 13076 ff. 225–82, was printed by Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca* I 61–96. In 1654, except for a few that remained in Sweden, they departed with the rest of the Queen's library for Rome, where they ought now to be among the Reginenses or the Ottoboniani; a catalogue drawn up on the way in 1655 survives in Vat. Lat. 8171 ff. 174–404. It is evident, however, that Vossius in 1655 kept some of them for himself, because there are many Petaviani, including D⁷⁰ of *Ibis*, among the Vossiani at Leyden.

What Alexander Petavius retained in 1650 either found its way into other Parisian libraries during his lifetime or was gradually sold off after his death in 1672; the undated *Catalogue des Manuscrits et Miniatures de feu Monsieur Petau, Conseiller à la Grand' Chambre de Paris* (accessible e.g. in Paris. Lat. 18610) apparently records the extent of what remained at his death. Two years before the final auction at the Hague in 1722, for which *Bibliotheca Petaviana et Mansartiana* was printed, 88 volumes went to a purchaser from Geneva, who left them to the library there.

4) This reading was discussed by Lenz in *Maia* xiv (1962) 109–16 after Questa's discovery of Ottob. 1469, where it first appears (*melius*). The Dresdensis that he refers to on p. 111 is Dc 147 (a twin of B⁹), in which *Metius* has been corrected to *Mettus* by a different but contemporary hand (mg. 'pro *Metius* ut ait Servius', sc. on *Aen.* 8. 642).

For further details see L. Delisle, *Le Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale* I (Paris 1868) 287–9; H. Aubert, *Notices sur les Manuscrits Petau conservés à la Bibliothèque de Genève* (Paris 1911); K. A. de Meyier, *Paul en Alexander Petau* (Leyden 1947) 128–39; E. Pellegrin, 'Manuscrits d'Auteurs Latins de l'Époque Classique conservés dans les Bibliothèques Publiques de Suède', *Bull. d'Inf. de l'I.R.H.T.* iii (1954, publ. 1955) 19–20; J. Bignami Odier, *Studi e Testi* ccxix (1962) 163, 181 n. 1, 183–4.

One Petavianus of Ovid, the Petavianus secundus of *Fasti*, has an uncertain history: it is now in the British Museum (Add. 49367) by way of Holkham Hall (320). According to Delisle, Petavianus have turned up not only at the places so far mentioned but also at Leipzig, Ghent, and Copenhagen, and de Meyier, 131 n. 12, reports one at Glasgow.

Manuscripts of *Ibis* registered in the catalogues referred to number three in 1645 (Montfaucon I 91), one in 1655 (if Bodl. d'Orville 42 is a faithful copy), and none in the 1680s.

P. 161 n. 127: This note should be ignored; when I wrote it, I did not know how unreliable Lenz's edition was. I shall discuss in a separate article the tradition of *Cons.* and the place of the Combianus in it; predictably, the text does not benefit from its rediscovery.

P. 161 n. 129: I followed Lenz in calling this manuscript Vat. Lat. 1621. It is actually Vat. Reg. Lat. 1621.

P. 161: The copies of the editions that Heinsius collated for *Cons.* are all in the Bodleian: B¹² and E⁹ = Auct. L 2 20 (ed. Rom. 1471)⁵, F⁹ = Auct. O 2 20 (ed. Bonon. 1480)⁶, G⁹ = Auct. O 2 24⁷.

As for the copy of the ed. Ven. 1474 from which he took C⁹, no copy of this edition appears in *Bibliotheca Heinsiana*, and so 'habui' probably does not mean that Rhodius had made him a

5) 'Contuli NH' f. 44r. When Heinsius owned it (*B.H.* II p. 68 no. 92), it was bound with Auct. L 2 21, not with Auct. L 2 19 (*ibid.* 96).

6) 'Contuli NH' f. 287r. It must be *B.H.* II p. 67 no. 61, and it may have belonged beforehand to Carolus Datus, because E⁷ of *Med.*, 'vetus editio quam habui a Carolo Dato' (= H⁷ of *Nux*), was a copy of the ed. Bonon. 1480 as well. Munari, 98 n. 3, identifies Auct. O 2 19, another copy of the same edition, with *B.H. ibid.* no. 60; as it certainly belonged to Bernard, he is no doubt right, but it bears no sign of Heinsius's ownership. Unlike this copy, Auct. O 2 20 lacks *Met.* and therewith the colophon.

7) This copy, owned by Is. Vossius before it came to Heinsius (*B.H.* II p. 68 no. 97), contains collations of two Vossiani, namely C⁸⁸ of *A.A.* and D⁷² of *Metamorphoses*.

present of it, any more than he ever owned B⁵ of *Met.*, 'quem Argentorati ab heredibus Berneggeri habui', or a¹² of *Trist.*, 'quod a Boxhornio habui' (cf. also M⁷ of *Her.* and H¹² of *Trist.*, which would probably have been identified by now if they had passed into Heinsius's possession). Rhodius's home town was Copenhagen, and most of his books went to his son-in-law, Thomas Bang; cf. C. Bruun, *Johan Rode* (Copenhagen 1893) 80-4. Dr Gad tells me, however, that his copy of the ed. Ven. 1474 does not appear in the auction catalogue of Thomas Bang's library and is not any of the three copies now in Copenhagen. If it remained in Padua, it may be one of the two mentioned in the *Indice Generale degli Incunaboli delle Biblioteche d'Italia* IV (Rome 1965) 7043.

P. 165 n. 142: In connexion with this manuscript Heinsius gave Medonius an interesting lesson in collation (*Syll.* V 651).

Now the *excerpta* again (pp. 162-5).

Salmasiana Excerpta

In Diez B Sant. 148e ff. 81-94 Heinsius cites from these *excerpta* a few readings not to be found in either Diez 8⁰ 2564 or Leid. Bibl. Publ. 755 H 12. He must therefore have seen the original *schedae*.

On the title page of Diez 8⁰ 2564 someone has written 'descripsi haec excerpta ex codice cuius illa margini ex Put. et Iur. libb. adscripserat Claudius Salmasius Hagae a. 39'. If it is Gronovius (and it can hardly be anyone else), he must have seen the *excerpta* more than once, and perhaps, if *schedae* is to be interpreted strictly, in more than one form.

In *A.A.*, *Rem.*, and *Ibis*, Gronovius nowhere names Salmasius's manuscript, but nearly all the readings he records fit the Divionensis. At least in *Rem.*, however, there are a few that do not, as was noticed by Lenz, *S.I.F.C.* xxxi (1959) 169-74: 112 *debuerat certa* (so Gronovius), 152 *candida castra*, 364 *quum volet*. The last of these may be insignificant, since the easiest way of recording a variant *cum* in a text that reads *quam* is to write *u* over the *a*; but I cannot account for the others. Lenz's suggestion that there may have been more than one liber Jureti is an uneconomical solution.

Salmasius's conjectures often anticipate later conjectures or readings later discovered in manuscripts, e.g. *Her.* 7. 138 *nato*,

8. 65 *num generis fato*, 9. 38 *terna*, 55 *errator*, 17. 262 *cunctatas*, *Am.*
 1. 8. 13 *suetam*, 2. 9b. 27 *relanguit*, 2. 10. 33 *arando*, 2. 13. 17 *sedit*,
 3. 13. 27 *Graio*.

Excerpta Scaligeri

My account of these was quite inadequate. Scaliger's copy, Diez 8^o 2560, contains marginal readings not just in *Her.*, *Rem.*, *Fasti*, and *Pont.*, but throughout. The readings entered in red are almost all, as I said, from Parisinus 8242⁸). The same hand has entered in brown two readings in *Her.*, 3. 30 *blandas ... preces* and 39 *Atride*. Most of the other entries in brown, if not all⁹), are in the hand of Scaliger; those underlined are conjectures or typographical amendments. In *Her.*, *Cons.*, *Nux.*, *Med.*, and *Trist.*, all Scaliger's entries are underlined. In *Am.* and *A.A.* his *excerpta* agree closely, as I said, with the *excerpta Puteani* of *sch.* 4, but neither set derives entirely from the other, because both contain readings absent from the other. On his sources for *Am.*, *A.A.*, *Rem.*, and *Pont.*, I have nothing to add¹⁰); his other manuscripts contained e.g. the following readings: *Fasti* 1. 567 *evulsum*, 591 *annosa*, 2. 37 *fuit*, 434 *rapuisse*, 3. 326 *queunt*, 4. 536 *cenae*, 5. 682 *praeteritae*, *Met.* 1. 492 *densis*, 2. 413 *positos sine lege*, 476 *arreptam*, 819 *caelatasque* (no other readings are cited in *Met.*).

Granted that the *excerpta Scaligeri* of *A.A.* and *Rem.* derive from R¹¹), a modern apparatus should treat the *excerpta Scaligeri* and *Puteani* as follows (the *exc. Put.*, except in *A.A.*, being those of *sch.* 4):

8) Some readings entered in red have come into modern editions by way of Heinsius's commentary under the name *excerpta Scaligeri*; see e.g. Kenney's text of *Amores* at 3.2.41, 3.3.40, 3.4.24, 3.6.59, 3.8.50. It is odd that Heinsius should have treated them as independent in this section of *Amores* and nowhere else.

9) The hand that has written alongside *Her.* 14. 111-8 'hi VIII versus sunt alieni huic loco' differs somewhat from the hand that has written alongside 85-110 'XXVI versiculi alieni sunt huic loco'; but Dan. Heinsius in the notes to his edition makes no distinction. Variation also occurs in *Fasti*.

10) - except that n. 136 can be cancelled.

11) I listed the discrepancies in *A.A.*; those in *Rem.* are 333 *uti*, 486 *distineatur*, 537 *perfruere*, 753 *lotosque*. They are not of equal weight. At *A.A.* 1.244 the first *i* of *vinis* in R was originally an *e*, and at *Rem.* 333, 486, 753, Scaliger's reading is only a minor adjustment of an impossible reading in R. All three discrepancies in *A.A.*, however, are common to the *exc. Scal.* and the *exc. Put.*, which suggests a common hyparchetype if their archetype was R; the only other possibility is that one set was augmented from the archetype or elsewhere after it had been copied from the other.

(1) in *A.A.* and *Rem.* the *exc. Scal.*, accompanied up to *A.A.* 2. 239 by the *exc. Put.*, should be cited only where they differ from R, when they have at best the authority of conjectures; (2) in *Her.* the *exc. Put.*, in *Am.* the *exc. Put.* and *Scal.*, and in *Fasti*, *Pont.*, and *Met.*, the *exc. Scal.*, can be subsumed under ω or ζ unless their reading is not otherwise attested, since they clearly derive from minor manuscripts.

Most of Scaliger's conjectures are mentioned by either Dan. or Nic. Heinsius, but not e.g. *Am.* 3. 6. 32 *Phthiotum*, *A.A.* 2. 119 *quae ... formam*, 698 *nudi*, 726 *desere*, *Fasti* 3. 706 *polluerunt*, *Trist.* 3. 11. 63-4 *vulnera ... ulcere*, *Met.* 11. 534 *sequius*. Some are wrongly attributed in modern editions to his *excerpta*, e.g. *A.A.* 1. 501 *aliquam ... puellam*, 2. 666 *legit*.

Vossiana Excerpta

The source of these was not twofold but threefold: the third constituent was a collation in *Fasti* of the Petavianus primus, represented by the symbol Nes., Mes., or M. (presumably Ger. Vossius's notation was not clear), or by no symbol at all¹²).

The unidentified manuscripts collated by Carrio, if Carrio it was, had e.g. the following readings (some of them already given in n. 141): *Rem.* 206 *suscipit*, 321 *talis quae posset amari*, 439 *di melius faciant moneamus*; *Pont.* 1. 1. 51 *lanigerae templum*, 63 *quorum est*, 1. 2. 11 *quin ego me*, 58 *comprimat*, 78 *terraque Oresteae Taurica sacra deae*; *Fasti*¹³ 1. 7 *edita*, 25 *sic erit et*, 67 *secreta*, 309 *numrabimus*; *Trist.* 1. 3. 77 *luctusque*, 1. 4. 15 *trabit*, 2. 20 *dabit*; *Met.* 1. 64 *sociam*, 2. 43 *non falsos*, 15. 90 *vivere fato animantis*; *Her.* 5. 30 *curva*, 20. 1 *suspecti nomen amantis*¹⁴.

12) Merkel, ed. of *Fasti* p. CCXCIII, is unreliable here: besides treating Nes. as a separate manuscript, he attributes to his 43 (the collation of the Petavianus) some readings that belong to either 40 (VN) or 41 (VA), e.g. 1.85 *conspicatur*, 97 *excruor*, 105 *nomina*. About V2 he is right; at any rate, all readings of V2 that I have checked are to be found in VA.

13) Ger. Vossius recorded the readings of this manuscript and Parisinus 8245 only up to 1.420, so that all readings thenceforward belong to the Petavianus. It might otherwise seem a coincidence that his *excerpta* stopped at 5.22.

14) E.-A. Kirfel, *Untersuchungen zur Briefform der Heroïdes Ovids* (Bern and Stuttgart 1969), 80 n. 223, does not mention that *suspecti* occurs in Harl. 2709 (La), which is nevertheless not identical with Carrio's manuscript.

Excerpta Douzæ

The *excerpta Douzæ* in Diez 8^o 2576–8 belong to Janus Douza; variants are cited only in *Her.* (e.g. 1.45 *riguere*, 2. 126 *suspitor*, 3. 145 *viscera*, 5. 106 *frigidus*), in *Am.* up to 3. 2. 68 (e.g. 1. 1. 19 *brevioribus*, 1. 3. 24 *pressa*, 1. 7. 6 *arma movere*), and in two lines of *Met.* (1. 52 *quanto pondere*, 162 *natos*). The *excerpta Douzæ* of *Fasti* in Bodl. Auct. ii R 6 21, a copy of the ed. Ald. 1533, belong to Franciscus Douza¹⁵).

Finally some additional notes and other collations of Ovid in Berlin and Oxford.

Diez B Sant. 148e ff. 249–52: a collation of the lost manuscript S⁹ for the first book of *Ex Ponto*.

ibid. ff. 258–68: a collation, against some expurgated edition, of a manuscript identifiable with Parisinus 7995.

ibid. ff. 306–13: a transcription by Hoogstratanus of the *excerpta Douzæ* and the *excerpta Scaligeri*.

ibid. ff. 340–2, 344–55, 358–63 (not, as I said, ff. 340–55): Heinsius's collation of Francof. Barth. 110.

Diez 8^o 2647: the codex Balthas. Huydecoperi collated by Burman is neither Bodl. d'Orville 169 nor Diez B Sant. 3.

Diez 8^o 2648 (ed. Amst. 1661): a collation up to *Met.* 2. 159 of a codex Wittianus membranaceus, namely E²⁵.

Bodl. Auct. S 5 4 (*Amatoria*, ed. Gryph. 1540), Auct. S. 5 3 (*Fasti* etc., ed. Gryph. 1546), Linc. 8^o D 215 (*Met.*, ed. Gryph. 1541): three volumes all signed by Nic. Faber and all containing collations by the same hand, apparently not his¹⁶). The manuscripts collated are as follows: Parisinus 8242 (the Puteaneus) in *Her.* and *Am.*; Vat. Reg. 1709 (the Petavianus primus) and Parisinus 7991 (a Thuanæus) in *Fasti*; Parisinus 8239 (a Puteaneus) in *Tristia*; Parisinus 8256 and 8462 (Thuanæi) in *Ex Ponto*; Parisinus 8253 (a Thuanæus) in *Met.* (collated in a different hand); a 'codex Hot.'¹⁷ of *Her.* that stopped at 20. 44 and read e.g. 1. 79 *tantum* (for *tenues*), 112 *erit*, 2. 45

15) Cf. Munari p. 113 and Wormell, *Hermathena* xciii (1959) 48. 'Jani' in Heinsius's description of D⁷³ is a mistake.

16) Munari, who drew attention to Auct. S 5 3 and 4 (p. 114), tentatively inferred from the signature 'N. Le Fevre' that he was the collator, but the hands look different.

17) This presumably belonged to either Franciscus Hotomannus, who died in 1590, or his son Johannes, who inherited his library; see *Grosses Universal-Lexicon* XIII (Leipzig 1735) col. 996–7.

recepti; a manuscript of *Rem.* completed 'anno domini MCC octuagesimo sexto die Mercurii ante festum beatae Mariae mense Septembri' that read e.g. 206 *suscipit*, 506 *clausa tibi*, 728 *basia*; and a manuscript of *Met.* that read e.g. 2. 15 *urbes-que domos*, 39 *subtrabe*, 70 *assueta*, 165 *sic etiam currus*. These collations recur, with some omissions¹⁸) and miscopyings, in Paris. Bibl. Nat. Yc 6309-11 (ed. Plant. 1575), where they are augmented by collations of Parisinus 7311 (the Regius) and 8071 (the Thuanæus of *Halientica*). The unknown author of these Parisian collations records at the beginning of *Amores* that the variants are 'ex v.c. cl. put.', which is nowhere stated in the Bodleian copy; it may therefore be that the Bodleian copy was annotated by Cl. Puteanus himself¹⁹).

Auct. ii R 6 20 (*Fasti* etc., ed. Ald. 1533): a neat and scrupulous collation of Vat. Reg. 1709 (the Petavianus primus).

The upshot of this investigation is that out of 286 manuscripts of Ovid collated during 1636-61 by Heinsius²⁰) 245 still exist, 13 do not, and 28 are unidentified. Even if the unidentified manuscripts are all lost, therefore, 85 % of what he collated sur-

18) The worst omission is that manuscripts are not distinguished when more than one is being reported.

19) Notes by someone of that name constitute Parisinus 7842, which according to the catalogue was apparently written in the 17th century (Cl. Puteanus died in 1595). Without seeing this manuscript and the Bodleian collations side by side, I cannot say more than that the hands are not obviously different. Heinsius saw a collation of the Puteanus made by Cl. Puteanus (*Syll.* II 744; he may of course be referring to the *exc. Put.*), and the shelf mark of the Bodleian collations suggests that they come from Heinsius's library; but they are not to be found in *Bibliotheca Heinsiana*.

20) He recorded a few readings from 11 more (three Regii, six Ambrosiani, a Vaticanus, and a Mediceus, all mentioned above or in the lists). I have not bothered to subtract the six manuscripts collated for him by Langermann (cf. p. 136 n. 9), which he would doubtless have collated himself if Langermann had not been on hand. If his manuscripts are counted separately for each work (except *Amores* 3,5), the total rises to 458: 47 of *Her.*, 22 of *Her.* 15, 22 of *Am.*, 40 of *A.A.*, 42 of *Rem.*, 12 of *Med.*, 18 of *Nux.*, 97 of *Met.*, 57 of *Fasti*, 34 of *Trist.*, 40 of *Pont.*, 21 of *Ibis*, 4 of *Cons.*, and 2 of *Halientica*. I exclude the Francofurtanus, which he did not collate until 1673, and the mysterious Helmstadiensis of *Metamorphoses*.

On the date of what must be the earliest collations see E. Hulshoff Pol, *Erano*s liii (1955) 78-80. Collations of the manuscript in question, Leid. Bibl. Publ. 179 ('contuli N. Heinsius 1636' f. 9), appear not only in Diez 4° 1068 but also in Diez 8° 2547 (ed. Lugd. 1536), which contains other collations repeated elsewhere. For early collations in other volumes see pp. 151 n. 68, 157 n. 103, Munari p. 99 (Auct. S 5 1).

vives. The other 15 % consists largely of manuscripts that were still in private ownership; otherwise the worst place for a manuscript to be at that time was a religious house in Padua or a college at Oxford or Cambridge.

In addition Heinsius had at his disposal full collations of 10 other manuscripts and *excerpta* from at least 26 more (at most 38). The 10 are identified (nine Palatini and a Petavianus). Of the 26, he subsequently collated 7 himself, all identified, but only 3 of the other 19 are identified; no doubt the reason is partly insufficient effort and partly the un informativeness of the *excerpta* themselves, but unless someone succeeds in identifying the sources of the fuller *excerpta*, it will be hard to escape the conclusion that manuscripts were much less secure in the sixteenth century than in the seventeenth.

Exeter College, Oxford

M. D. Reeve

I append a note on the three manuscripts of Ovid used by Gregorius Bersmanus. How many editions the various parts of his three volumes went through, and where they all appeared, I am quite unable to determine, but his prefaces to the second (*Met.*) and third (*Fasti* etc.) are dated 1582 in all editions that I have seen. In the preface to the second he mentions a manuscript 'quem ab optimo et viro et poeta..., Dn. Nathane Chytraeo, nuper dono accepi' and another 'quem mihi utendum dedit ... Adamus Siberus'. On p. 468 of *Mus. Brit.* 1001 c 5, a copy of vol. 3 dated 1596, he mentions a manuscript 'quem Ferraria nobiscum attulimus'; this is the codex Bersmannianus of *Ibis* that according to La Penna, ed. (Florence 1957) cliii, 'nondum reperiri potuit'. W. Schubert, *de Gregorio Bersmano philologo et poeta* (Zerbst 1853) 50-1, adds nothing about the two manuscripts of *Met.* but in a footnote has this to say about the other: 'Hic codex Tristium etc. in thesauris Bibliothecae Dessaviensis repositus est. Literis iis, quae usu nobis receptae sunt, tenuioribus scriptus, signa sane recentioris aetatis prae se fert'; he then transcribes Bersmanus's note of presentation in 1609 'Dn. Iohanni Georgio, Pr. Anhaltino', which states that he had brought it from Ferrara in 1564. In view of the first sentence I wrote to the Stadtbibliothek at Dessau inquiring whether the manuscript was still there and whether the library had any manuscripts of *Met.*, and on 30.1.74 Dr Eberhard Ehlert kindly re-

plied as follows: 'Die von Ihnen gesuchte Handschrift ist leider bei uns nicht mehr vorhanden. Vermutlich handelt es sich um einen unserer zahlreichen Kriegsverluste. Zu unseren Beständen gehören noch folgende Handschriften zu Ovid: (1) HB 8 (8^o): Metamorphosen, lat., 116 Blätter, Pergament, wahrscheinlich 11. oder 12. Jahrhundert; (2) HB 15 (4^o): De remedio amoris, lat., 15 Blätter, Papier, 1791'. It remains to be seen whether the manuscript of *Met.*, not recorded in Munari's *Catalogue* or either of his supplements, is one of the two used by Bersmanus (and also whether it really belongs to the 11th or 12th century).

M. D. Reeve