

THREE NOTES ON OVID

(1) IN 1910 the bookseller Hiersemann of Leipzig bought at Sotheby's a manuscript of *Metamorphoses* described as a 'manuscript of the twelfth century, finely written on vellum, bound in oak boards, covered with stamped leather';¹ it was one of the many manuscripts of Ovid owned by Sir Thomas Phillipps, Phillippicus 1038.² Its whereabouts since 1910 are unknown. Also unknown are the whereabouts of Phillippicus 2709, a thirteenth-century manuscript of *Metamorphoses*.³

In 1919 or shortly before, a manuscript of *Metamorphoses* supposedly dating from the twelfth century passed mysteriously through the hands of the same Hiersemann.⁴ It was bound in wooden boards covered by Venetian leather of the sixteenth century.⁵ This Venetian leather gave D. A. Slater⁶ the idea that the manuscript might have been identical with an important manuscript collated by Heinsius but since missing, 'codex Sti Iohannis in Viridario Patavinus, quingentorum annorum, quem ab eodem Turriano⁷ accepi utendum. In illo codice erant adscripta argumenta Luctatii omnia.'

In 1940 a manuscript of *Metamorphoses* dating from the thirteenth century went up in flames at Louvain.⁸ Fortunately a full description of it survived,⁹ and one stage in its history stands out: the University of Louvain bought it in 1921 from Hiersemann, who had bought it from a German artist who died in 1918. As for the manuscript itself, it was bound in wooden boards covered by Venetian leather; and lest the resemblances so far be put down to coincidence, it bore inside the cover a more or less decipherable inscription plainly identical with the inscription inside the cover of Hiersemann's mysterious manuscript.¹⁰

Five manuscripts are therefore reduced to four. Four are reduced to three if Phillippicus 2709 can be identified with Phillippicus 1038, which it very probably can.¹¹ Suppose that the manuscript bought by Hiersemann in 1910 was sold to the artist from whom he acquired just such a manuscript in 1918, and three are reduced to two. Was Slater right, and can two be reduced to one? Fortunately for the text, no. The manuscript at Louvain did not contain the *argumenta*, and its *explicit* read not 'Publii Nasonis Ovidii Metamorphoseon

¹ See the catalogue for 8 June 1910. The buyer's name is entered in the copy photographed for the Bodleian, R. Cat. 310 P/11.

² No. 282 in Munari's *Catalogue of the Mss. of Ovid's Metamorphoses*, B.I.C.S. Supp. 4 (1957). None of the pertinent catalogues in the Bodleian bears out Munari's statement that a previous owner was 'Count MacCarthy (*Sale Catal.*, 1817, lot 829).'

³ Munari no. 283.

⁴ H. Degering, *Sitzungsber. der Preuss. Akad. der Wiss.* (1919), 468-76; Lindsay, *C.R.* xxxiii (1919), 152; Lowe, *C.R.* xxxvii (1923), 24.

⁵ Degering, p. 472.

⁶ *C.R.* xxxvii (1923), 66.

⁷ Not 'Turreno', as Slater read it. For Georgius Turrianus, 'medicus Patavinus' as

Heinsius calls him elsewhere, see *Grosses Universal-Lexicon*, xlv (Leipzig, 1745), col. 1970.

⁸ Munari no. 174.

⁹ M.-Th. Vernet-Boucrel in *Mélanges Gratii* (Paris, 1949), 373-5.

¹⁰ Degering, p. 472.

¹¹ Both numbers are given in the annotated catalogue to the manuscript sold in 1910 (cf. n. 1); and whatever the significance of this, certainly nothing else seems to have been heard of 2709. Duplication of numbers befell a Phillippicus of *Tristia*, 960 = 2767, and Mr. A. R. A. Hobson of Sotheby's kindly writes that 'Phillipps frequently gave two numbers to the same manuscript by mistake'.

quintus decimus et ultimus liber explicit'¹ but 'Publii Ovidii Nasonis Metamorphoseon liber xv explicit'.²

Nothing more has come to light about the Paduan manuscript than was ascertained by Slater: it had disappeared from S. Giovanni di Verdara before 1760.³

(2) *Ex Ponto* 1. 1. 31 adiuuat in bello pacatae ramus olivae

Editors appear to have recognized no difference between 'pacifying', which the text might reasonably if superfluously have said, and 'pacified', which is what it does say. In fact Ovid wrote neither: he wrote 'berried', *bacatae*. For the corruption cf. *Am.* 2. 16. 8 *baciferam* P, *paciferam* S.

The conjecture has been in some sense anticipated. Two of the five volumes that Heinsius filled with collations of *ex Ponto* are in the Bodleian Library; in one of them, Auct. S 5 12, he has underlined *pacatae*, a sign that he was unhappy about it, and in the other, Auct. S 5 9, he has recorded 'vel *baccatae*' from his Thuanaeus A. The existence of this variant in Parisinus Lat. 8256, 'ajouté dans l'interligne inférieur' according to a prompt communication from Dr. M.-P. Laffitte of the Bibliothèque Nationale, is one of several reasons for regarding the two manuscripts as identical.

- (3) *Amores* 1. 8. 61-8 qui dabit, ille tibi magno sit maior Homero;
 crede mihi, res est ingeniosa dare.
 nec tu, si quis erit capitis mercede redemptus,
 despicie: gypsati crimen inane pedis.
 nec te decipiant veteres circum atria cerae:
 tolle tuos tecum, pauper amator, avos.
 67 quin, quia pulcher erit, poscet sine munere noctem;
 quod det, amatorem flagitet ante suum.
 67 quin P, Ehwald, Munari, Kenney: qui ω

There is no reason other than the eminence of P why *quin* should be preferred.

¹ So Heinsius's Patavinus in Bodl. Auct. S 5 8.

² This can be verified from a photograph in the possession of the Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, Paris. Another photograph shows that the inside of the back cover, unlike the inside of the front cover, was bare, so that there is no reason why the controversial fragment of Plautus should not have been detached from it as Hiersemann said; on the contrary, the measurements are very much in his favour (Ovid 220 × 147 mm., Plautus 210 × 152 mm.). Not that forgery is in doubt: cf. Norden, *Sitzungsber. der preuss. Akad.* 1924 p. 163. Another forgery from the same source was exposed by Degering, *Arch. Anz.* xxxviii-xxxix (1923-4), 13-22; but either Degering went too far in suspecting the portrait of Virgil (p. 19) or the

forger had been at work before 1896, when the manuscript was described in Sotheby's catalogue of Phillippici for sale on the 17th of June (no. 1267: 'with portrait of Virgil in the first initial letter').

³ Slater actually reports that it had disappeared before 1760 from the Marciana, but either he or his informant has garbled the truth. No collection of manuscripts from S. Giovanni di Verdara went to the Marciana before 1784; see Valentinielli, *Bibliotheca Manuscripta ad S. Marci Venetiarum* i (1868), 88. 1760 is the date of a handwritten catalogue that passed to the Marciana, now cod. It. XI 323 (7107), and the manuscript is missing from this catalogue. On the depletion of the library before 1784 see L. Dorez, *Mélanges G. B. de Rossi* (supplement to *Mélanges d'Arch. et d'Hist.*, 1892), 115-16.

The sense 'indeed' is not required, and a subject for *pulcher erit*, which is, can be supplied from the previous line only at the cost of a change from second person to third and an unwarranted implication that among the girl's poverty-stricken admirers it is the patricians who will try to make capital of their looks. The other reading, followed of course by a comma at the end of the line, introduces without emphasis a third class entirely separate from the first two, and that is surely what Ovid intended.¹

Exeter College, Oxford

M. D. REEVE

¹ After this note had been written, Mr. A. S. Hollis pointed out that *qui* had already been commended by A. G. Lee in his translation (John Murray, London, 1968), p. 183:

'*quin* . . . introducing a statement in the sense of *immo* doesn't quite fit here'. With Mr. Lee's permission the note has been left to stand, since it offers a second objection to *quin*.