

Beweis für Eratosthenes als Autor zu erbringen, und er hat einmal – sollen wir sagen: ein andermal? – das Sternbild *Ara* in die Titanomachie hineingestellt, wovon hier keine Rede ist. Insgesamt aber überwiegt durchaus die Freude an dichterischer Aussage vor allem Fachwissen, aller Mythenkenntnis oder Mythenkonstruktion. Auch das spräche dafür, diese Hexameter in die Zeit der Hochblüte alexandrinischer Dichtung anzusetzen.

München

Max Treu

A NOTE ON GESNER'S COLLATION
OF THE MENDOZA MANUSCRIPT
OF STOBÆUS¹⁾

In the preface (p. xxii) to his second edition of Stobæus' *Florilegium* (*Κέρας Ἀμαλθαίας* [*sic!*], Basel 1549), Conrad Gesner avers that he had used a codex belonging to D. Diego Hurtado de Mendoza (= M: now *Escorialensis* LXXXX [II. Σ. 14])²⁾ in the preparation of this edition. This enabled him to add new sections and many other individual excerpts to the *Florilegium* that were hitherto unknown to Gesner and to the *editor princeps*, Trincavellus; to improve the text of the previously known excerpts in countless passages; and finally to supplement authorial attributions in many places with the titles of the plays from which comic and tragic excerpts had been taken. However, the liberties which at the same time Gesner took – for instance, in the wilful re-ordering of the excerpts – are notorious: it might well have been said of him, *egregium laborem corrupit*.

Yet in the attempt to weigh the merits of Gesner's second edition against its vices, Gesner's own manuscript notes have not previously been consulted, so far as I know; consequently

1) This brief paper is a by-product of work done with the support of the Research Fund of the University of Newcastle upon Tyne: of whose generosity recognition is owed and most gratefully given.

2) For the fullest description of this codex, see Hense's edition, III. praef. xxix ff.

even Otto Hense, in his masterly survey of the relevant problems (Rh. Mus. 39, 1884, 359-407 & 521-57, esp. 380ff.), was able to write, "Wenn Gesner in Bezug auf das aus M gegenüber T[rincavellus' Codex] neu hinzukommende Material in der praef. a. a. O. bemerkt: *ea transcripsi omnia*, so mag sich diese Bemerkung allenfalls auf seine eigenen Schedae beziehen, auf die Ausgabe selbst findet sie keineswegs in vollem Sinne Anwendung". In other words, there were puzzling (if sometimes minor) differences between the Mendoza codex and Gesner's additions or alterations for his second edition.

The purpose of this short note is merely to call attention to the existence and location of part at least of what may be Gesner's own *schedae*³). At any rate, extensive marginalia exist, written apparently in his own hand, in Gesner's own copy of his first edition of the *Florilegium* (Zurich 1543), now in the Library of the British Museum (press mark C. 134. i. 3, formerly 11350. h. 8)⁴). A study of all Gesner's entries would consume

3) Part, unfortunately, and not all: for these marginalia of Gesner appear not to include any transcription, so far as I can see, of the excerpts from the two new sections (*de virtute et vitio, de intemperantia*: see the unpaginated preface to Gesner^a, "*de altera hac editione*") added by Gesner in his second edition – a serious loss, especially in view of our ignorance about Gesner's motives for regrouping his material. In the other sections, additional material (including the new fragments) is penned in the marginal space as best it can.

4) Manuscript entries in the fly-leaves give the names of two of this book's owners before it came to rest in the British Museum: (1) M(agister) Joh. Georgius von Zabern *Argentensis*, 1767 (noting "*Ipsum hoc est exemplar, quod ipse, qui hanc Stobaei editionem, Conr. Gesnerus manibus trivit, cuique observationes suas, minime illas contemnendas larga (? or the ungrammatical largo) manu adpersit, magno hinc in pretio habendum*"); (2) J(ohn) Mitford, 1803. J. G. von Zabern (here I am grateful to Mme M. Lang, of the Bibliothèque Nationale et Universitaire, Strasbourg, for fully documented information) was born in 1733 of an old Strasbourg family and after graduating Magister at his city's university in 1756 spent his life in and around Strasbourg as a minister of the Protestant Church (M. J. Bopp, *Die evangelischen Geistlichen und Theologen in Elsaß und Lothringen*, I [1959] 601). He was a collector of classical and theological works, and at his death in 1825 the catalogue of his books drawn up for their public sale in Mainz listed some 2500 volumes "*inter variores et rarissimos ex parte*". Not surprisingly the Gesner edition is not included in this catalogue, since it came into the possession of John Mitford (1781-1859), the English clergyman, poetaster, cricketer, bibliophile, editor of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, and expert on English poetry, some twenty years or so before von Zabern's death while Mitford was still at Oxford. Mr. H. M. Nixon, of the British Museum, confirms that it was purchased for the Museum Library on Mitford's death.

(and perhaps also waste) much time and labour, and ought in any case to be left to a Stobaeus specialist; but one or two minor points of interest for the history of scholarship emerge from a cursory examination, which it may be worth while to set down here succinctly.

First, the titles of plays, etc., in the lemmata of the excerpts. When M's titles are correct and uncorrupted (e.g., 27.9 Me[ineke], III.27.9 H[ense], *ὀλυνθίων*; 59.2 Me., IV.17.2 H., *συναποθνησκόντων*; 108.52 Me., IV.44.44 H., *φιλοτραγωδοῦ*), Gesner's marginalia record M's readings exactly, though these are latinised in the printed margins of his second edition (thus *in Olynthiis*, *in Commorientibus*, *in Philotragedo*). When M's titles are corrupt, however, Gesner records the readings as accurately as he can in his marginalia (e.g., 29.33 Me., III.29.34 H.: M ἀχλιτῶ^υ, Gesner's marg. ἀχλιτῶξ⁵); 116.19 Me., IV.50.54 H.: M & Gesner's marg. Τιθης), but in his second edition he substitutes either conjecture (ἀχλιτῶ^υ induces the wild guess *in Orchestride*, the easy correction to Ἀχαιῖδι being made by Gaisford) or silence (as with Τιθης: no title is printed by Gesner in his second edition, though Gaisford's correction to Τιτθης was again easy).

In the text of the fragments also the marginalia record M's readings pretty faithfully, but Gesner shows himself no slave to these readings in his second edition. M's manifest improvements (e.g., 108.52 Me., IV.44.44 H.: with *ὀρθῶς* where Gesner¹ and Trincavellus have the unmetrical *εῖ*) are usually accepted, but there is no question of alteration for alteration's sake (e.g., 29.33 Me., III.29.34 H., v. 5 of the fragment: the marginalia record M's addition of τ', but Gesner² omits the particle, just as the first edition did). Sometimes Gesner writes out M's reading, only to score it out neatly – evidence either of later second thoughts, or perhaps of the immediate rejection of an M reading. Naturally, Gesner is sometimes right over such rejections (63.13 Me., IV.20.13 H., v. 7 of the fr. as given in the Stobaeus mss.: Gesner¹ correctly prints τῶ θεῶ; the marginalia record τ̄ [= τῶ!]¹ θεῶν, apparently a misreading of M's τ̄¹ων

5) The supralineal epsilon above the ^υ at the end of Gesner's transcription here is hard to explain. A photograph of the codex at this point reveals the second epsilon of *εὐκλεής* in the previous line directly above the supralineal ^υ of the codex, but it would be absurd to imagine anyone reading this in conjunction with the ^υ.

[= $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$] $\theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}\nu$ ⁶); the marginalia note is scored out, presumably because $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}\nu$ appeared impossible Greek here; not surprisingly Gesner² retains $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega}$), and sometimes wrong (73.61 Me., IV. 22. 193 H.): at v. 10 of the fr., M's correct $\epsilon\lambda\pi\epsilon$ is recorded in the marginalia but scored out, and Gesner² wrongly retains $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$).

Such points as these admittedly shed light rather on Gesner's judgment and method than on the text of Stobaeus itself, and it is perhaps doubtful whether detailed study of these marginalia will make any positive contribution to the latter end. That, however, must be decided by Stobaeus specialists⁸).

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

W. Geoffrey Arnott

6) One must assume that Gesner carelessly failed to notice the nu after $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ in the codex; or is it possible that these marginalia were not directly copied from the codex itself but from a previously made transcription? If so, Gesner could have first hurriedly copied the codex's $\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ as $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ and later misread this as $\tau\tilde{\omega}$.

7) This fragment clearly reveals Gesner's qualities and limitations as an editor: he rightly accepts M's $\delta'\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ at v. 16, but wrongly rejects its $\epsilon\lambda\pi\epsilon$ at v. 10; at v. 5 he prints in Gesner² (with Meineke and Hense) M's $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\tau\eta$, while Gesner¹ (with Gaisford) prints S's $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\tau\eta$; at v. 22 M's reading is recorded in the marginalia (as $\pi\eta\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu$!), but Gesner fails to see that his transcription conceals the correct $\pi\eta\rho\tilde{\omega}\nu$.

8) Mr. E. W. Handley was kind enough to read and comment on this note before publication.

Mitteilung des Verlages

Auf Grund des § 5, Absatz 2, des Hess. Gesetzes über Freiheit und Recht der Presse in der Fassung vom 20. 11. 1958 gebe ich bekannt: Alleiniger Inhaber und Geschäftsführer von J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag ist Verleger Albrecht Gruber, wohnhaft in Frankfurt am Main.

Schriftleiter: Prof. Dr. Ernst Vogt, Bonn, Lennéstraße 26/28
 Druckerei: H. Laupp jr, Tübingen. Verlag: J. D. Sauerländer, Frankfurt am Main
 Manuskripte sind (möglichst in Maschinschrift) an Prof. Dr. Dr. h. c. Hans Herter,
 Bonn, Kurfürstenstraße 52, nach vorübergehender Anfrage einzusenden
 Printed in Germany. © J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag, Frankfurt a. M. 1967