

IDENTIFICATION OF ANOTHER HEINSIAN MANUSCRIPT

In his recent second supplement to his invaluable catalogue of manuscripts of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*,¹ Munari reports two manuscripts from the Bibliotheca Vallicelliana in Rome. The second of these, number 405 in his cumulative list, is *Bibl. Vallicelliana* F 25. According to the description supplied to Munari and so quoted, the manuscript is a miscellany, 230×142 mm., membr. fourteenth century, and the Ovidian material is the last or number 7 of the miscellaneous pieces, fols. 117–34. So far, the information is correct. However, on a crucial point, namely the exact contents of the Ovidian poem preserved, the data are in error. Munari's informant from the Roman library seems to have given only a cursory glance at the 18 folia and then reported that they contained *Met.* 2. 88–777. In fact, the 18 leaves are in wild disorder, and they offer portions of eight different books, for a total of approximately 1,690 verses, equivalent to more than two average books.² Moreover, following a lead suggested by D.A. Slater's researches and now confirmed by the recent work of M.D. Reeve, I have been able to establish that these 18 folia constitute an Ovidian fragment first critically used by Nicholaas Heinsius. I shall first describe the contents of the 18 folia, then indicate the process of identification.

Since the Ovidian lines are entirely independent of the other material in the manuscript, I shall not use the continuous numbering 117–34, but number the leaves 1 to 18. Accordingly, the contents of successive folia are as follows: fol. 1:2. 41–134; fol. 2:2. 323–410; fol. 3:14. 585–674 (*man. alt.*); fol. 4:12. 117–210; fol. 5:11. 639–732; fol. 6:11. 74–167; fol. 7:4. 567–660; fol. 8:4. 755–5. 45; fol. 9:5. 46–140; fol. 10:5. 141–234; fol. 11: EXPLICIT LIBER III INCIPIT LIBER IV 4. 1–94; fol. 12:3. 544–635 (+636–9 *man. alt.*); fol. 13:8. 607–700; fol. 14:8. 701–93; fol. 15:8. 514–606; fol. 16:8. 136–229; fol. 17:8.42–135; fol. 18:2. 685–777. To reorganize these folia in the correct sequence of the poem, we may say that the fragment in F 25 preserves 2. 41–134, 323–410, and 685–777, 3. 544–639 and the explicit of the book, 4. 1–94, 567–660, and 755–5. 234, 8. 42–229 and 514–793, 11. 74–167 and 639–732, 12. 117–210, 14. 585–674.

D.A. Slater was the first to make extensive use of the workbooks of Heinsius that had been discovered in the Bodleian Library at the end of the nineteenth century. In the table of contents for the collations of the *Metamorphoses* which Heinsius assembled in *Auct. S.* 5. 8 and Slater cited, I was struck by one entry: 'Fragmentum apud patres oratori(os?) Romae sescentorum annorum ex variis Met. libris.'³ The phrase 'ex variis Met. libris', it seemed, might point to the disordered collection in *Bibl. Vallicelliana* F 25, and the phrase 'apud patres oratorios' might denote the followers of Filippo Neri, who after 1575 were established next to the church of S. Maria in Vallicella (the future Chiesa Nuova) and were called *patres oratorii* or Filippini. At this point, M.D. Reeve much facilitated my task.⁴ He had already thoroughly studied *Auct. S.* 5. 8, and he supplied me with

¹ F. Munari in *Studia Florentina A. Ronconi oblata* (Rome, 1970), 275–80.

² There are usually 94 lines in each folium. The product of 94×18 is 1,692.

³ D. A. Slater, *Toward a Text of the Metamorphosis of Ovid* (Oxford 1927), p. 32 of

the Prolegomena.

⁴ M.D. Reeve kindly communicated to me the contents of a forthcoming article (now published in *Rb. Mus.* 117, 1974, 133–66); see especially his note 77.

his estimate of the sequential contents of Heinsius's fragment, as gleaned from the collation. His figures and mine are too closely parallel to leave room for doubt. Reeve also reported that Heinsius for some reason had changed his description of the manuscript and, in his published edition, assigned it to the Theatines in Rome. When one checks Heinsius's critical comments, one finds F 25 first cited as *excerpta Theatinorum Romana* (ad 2. 116), then somewhat differently as *veterrimum fragmentum Theatinorum Romae* (ad 4. 68), and differently again as *schedae vetustissimae Theatinorum Romae* (ad 4. 650); elsewhere he abbreviated the citation down to *fragm. Theatin.* and the like. Selected readings from *Auct. S. 5. 8* and Heinsius's edition confirm the identification: 3. 552 furore, 4. 647 servare, 4. 650 foribusque, 5. 48 ligneis, 8. 203 limine, 8. 525 *ad marg.*, 8. 527 heu heu (Oeneus *div. lect.*), 8. 637 paucos, 8. 736 nitidarum.⁵ Accordingly, *Bibl. Vallicelliana* F 25 is the manuscript which Heinsius called in *Auct. S. 5. 8* 'Fragmentum apud patres oratorios Romae', but in his printed commentary assigned to the Theatines in Rome. It has not strayed an inch from the place where Heinsius originally read it.

It remains to point out that *Excerpta*, *Schedae*, or *Fragmentum Theatinorum* was a misnomer on Heinsius's part, which no doubt has slowed down the identification of this manuscript. The Theatines differed appreciably from the Filippines, and they had different centres and libraries in Rome. The Theatine Library would presumably have been connected with the church of S. Andrea della Valle by 1588; the *patres oratorii* or Filippines were connected, as I said, with S. Maria in Vallicella and, by Heinsius's visit, with Borromini's elegant Oratorio dei Filippini next door. In the attached monastery they lived and read their books, among which was F 25. Indeed, it appears that the spiritual methods of the Theatines and Filippines differed enough for one to expect a manuscript of the *Metamorphoses* to be in the possession of the latter because of their greater cultural and generally aesthetic interests.

University of California, Berkeley

WILLIAM S. ANDERSON

⁵ In addition to the lines cited, Heinsius used his so-called Theatine fragment at 2. 758, 3. 615, 4. 662 and 766, 5. 195, 8.

594, 11. 151 and 688, 12. 139, 151, and 158. Thus, he used 14 of the 18 folia in his commentary.