

**XIX.—Source-Editions of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (1471–1500)**

GRUNDY STEINER

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

No complete stemma for the printed editions of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* in the early years of printing has ever been published, although occasional suggestions about the ancestry of particular editions are to be found in the *Catalogue of books printed in the XVth century now in the British Museum*, Graesse's *Trésor*, Dibdin's *Introduction* and elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> The immediate purpose of this paper is to report the identity of those few printings of the *Metamorphoses* issued from 1471 to 1500 from which all the others were reprinted or prepared without significant textual change.

This information is presented as the foundation for a subsequent detailed study of the filiation of the printed editions of the *Metamorphoses* from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. It can, however, serve a second purpose, that of completing the list of editions, printed before 1500, which may be of use as sources for manuscript readings of Ovid's text, a list begun, in a sense, by Hugo Magnus in the *apparatus criticus* of his renowned edition of the *Metamorphoses* (Berlin 1914).<sup>2</sup>

To identify these source-editions is the primary aim of this paper. A subsidiary aim is to attempt to discover reasons for the merits and failings of the texts under consideration as well as reasons for their subsequent popularity or neglect. Therefore evidence is reported about the circumstances of the editorial work and printing of each edition, and attention is paid to factors which may have influenced the frequency with which each was reprinted.

Of the thirty-four printings known, twenty-six have been seen in libraries or studied by means of microfilm copies.<sup>3</sup> They have been examined in two ways to determine their relationships. The first method was a search for external criteria: the presence of

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, the quotation from Dibdin below (note 15).

<sup>2</sup> Magnus saw fit to incorporate readings from Items 2a and 5g of the general list presented here as well as from the first Aldine edition (1502).

<sup>3</sup> The author is obligated to the Committee on Research Funds of the Graduate School of Northwestern University for grants to secure microfilm copies essential to this study.

*argumenta*, commentaries, and the signatures of editors in accompanying epistles, incipits, and colophons. The second was a collation of test passages.<sup>4</sup>

The names of seven apparent editors were found: Franciscus Puteolanus, Joannes Andreas, Joannes Calphurnius, Joannes Bonus Accursius, Domitius Calderinus, Bartholomeus Merula, and Raphael Regius. Several printings remained unclassified since external criteria are lacking. This evidence, accordingly, should require seven or more groups of printings. But the collation narrowed the field to five groups ranging in size from two printings to thirteen with one isolated edition requiring separate treatment. The reduction in number of groups occurs because the collation reveals no significant differences between the texts to which the names of Bonus Accursius and Calderinus are attached and shows further that Merula's unauthorized printings which contain the commentary by Regius differ only occasionally in text of Ovid from the series issued with the commentator's approval.

All the printings considered in this study are listed here in the groups established by means of the collation.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The collation for this study includes test passages from *Met.* 3, 7, and 12 for all editions and a complete collation of *Met.* 7 for the source-editions. The choice was dictated originally by the requirements of the author's paper entitled "Golding's Use of the Regius-Micyllus Commentary upon Ovid," *JEGP* 49 (1950) 317-323, but the readings illustrate the affinities of the editions as well.

<sup>5</sup> The following data are given: a siglum for references throughout this paper, the year of publication, the contents of the edition (whether the complete works or the *Metamorphoses* only) and the name of the editor, the name of the printer, and finally representative bibliographical citations.

The following abbreviations are used for bibliographic works cited both in the list above and throughout the paper:

BMC: British Museum, *Catalogue of Books Printed in the XVth Century Now in the British Museum* (London 1908-date).

BNC: Bibliothèque Nationale, *Catalogue Général des Livres Imprimés* (Paris 1897-date).

Bodl.: Bodleian Library, Oxford, *Catalogus Librorum Impressorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae* (Oxford 1843-51).

C: Copinger, W. A., *Supplement to Hain's Repertorium Bibliographicum* (London 1895-1902).

Ebert: Ebert, F. A., *Allgemeines bibliographisches Lexicon* (Leipzig 1821-30).

Graesse: Graesse, J. G. Th., *Trésor de Livres Rares et Précieux* (Dresden 1859-69).

H: Hain, L., *Repertorium Bibliographicum* (Stuttgart 1826-38).

HC: H(Hain) + C(Copinger).

HCR: H(Hain) + C(Copinger) + R(Reichling).

Lyons Cat.: Baudrier, H. L., *Bibliographie Lyonnaise* (Lyon 1895-1921).

Pr.: Proctor, R. G. C., *An Index to the Early Printed Books in the British Museum* (London 1898-1906).

## 1. PUTEOLANUS

- 1a. 1471, Bologna: *Opera*, Puteolanus: Balt. Azoguidus: HC 12136; BMC 6.798; St. O 117.
- 1b. 1476, Ferrara: *Met.*, Puteolanus: Aug. Carnerius: Ebert 2.268, no. 15418; H 12158.
- 1c. 1480, Bologna: *Opera*, [No Ed.]: Balt. Azoguidus: HC 12142; BMC 6.801.

## 2. ANDREAS

- 2a. 1471, Rome: *Opera*, Joh. Andreas: Sweynheym and Pannartz: HC 12137; BMC 4.14; St. O 118.
- 2b. [ca. 1475]: Louvain: *Met.*, Joh. Andreas: Johann of Paderborn (Westphalia): HC 12154; Pr. 9253; St. O 162.

## 3. [FEDERICUS DE COMITIBUS]

- 3a. [1472, Venice]: *Met.*, [No Ed.]: [F. de Comitibus]: HC 12153; BMC 7.1134; St. O 161.

R: Reichling, D., *Appendices ad Hainii-Copingeri Repertorium Bibliographicum* (Munich 1905-1914).

St.: Stillwell, Margaret B., *Incunabula in American Libraries* (New York, 1940).

As indicated by the asterisks, eight of the thirty-four printings have not been available for this study. Library locations for Items \*6g, \*6h, and \*6i are known but microfilm has not as yet been received. Possibly some of the remaining five will prove to be "ghosts."

The following are regarded as doubtful editions:

- \*1472 Venice: *Met.*: Jac. Rubeus: H +12156 (cf. BMC 5.xiv).
- \*[1477 Louvain]: *Met.*: [Joh. of Paderborn]. A microfilm copy of this doubtful printing, obtained on the strength of the entry in the *Catalogue of the Printed Books . . . in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester 1899) 2.1328, shows that the book listed is identical with Item 2b.
- \*1480 Venice: *Opera*: Bonus Accursius: Ber. Novariensis. "1480" is evidently a misprint for "1486" in BNC 128.559, no. 14, since HC \*12143, the bibliographical citation, belongs to the latter date. The first accepted appearance of the printer's name (cf. BMC 5.xxxv) is October 12, 1484 in an edition of Cicero, *De Off.*
- \*1484 Venice: *Opera*: H. Lichtenstein: H \*12149; BMC 5.357; St. O 123. This edition appears to be a reissue of the sheets of the second volume of Item 5f. No such reissue of the first, which contains the *Metamorphoses*, seems to be known (BMC 5.357).
- \*1488 Venice: *Opera*: Math. Capcasa: H + 12144. This is probably an echo of Item 5h arising from confusion over the year meant by the date "Anno .Mccccxxxviii Pridie Calendas Ianuarias."

Entry 455 under "Ovide" in BNC 128 is tentatively regarded as a duplicate of Item 4b. Possibly certain other extant editions have been erroneously identified with volumes on the list given here, but the thirty-four items presented should be a representative record, if not a complete record, of the printing of the *Metamorphoses* in the fifteenth century.

## 4. CALPHURNIUS

- 4a. 1474, [Venice]: *Opera*, Joh. Calphurnius: Jac. Rubeus: HC 12138; BMC 5.214; St. O 119.
- 4b. [ca. 1476, Rostock]: *Met.*, [No Ed.]: [fratres hortus viridis]: Bodl. 2.914; and 4.692.
- 4c. 1480, Pinerolo: *Met.*, [No Ed.]: Jac. Rubeus: HC 12161; BMC 7.1083; St. O 165.

## 5. ACCURSIUS

- 5a. 1475, Milan: *Met.*, Bonus Accursius: Ph. de Lavagnia: HC 12157; BMC 6.701; St. O 163.
- 5b. 1477, Parma: *Opera*, Dom. Calderinus: St. Corallus: HC \*12140; BMC 7.940; St. O 120.
- 5c. 1477, Milan: *Opera*, Bonus Accursius: Ant. Zarotus: H 12139 (I); St. O 121.
- 5d. 1479, Parma: *Met.*, Dom. Calderinus: [No Pr.]: HC \*12159; BMC 7.941; St. O 164.
- 5e. 1480, Parma: *Met.*, Dom. Calderinus: And. Portilia: H \*12160; BMC 7.937; St. O 166.
- 5f. 1480, Vicenza: *Opera*, Bonus Accursius: H. Lichtenstein: HC \*12141; BMC 7.1037; St. O 122.
- 5g. 1486, Venice: *Opera*, Bonus Accursius: Ber. Novariensis: HC \*12143; BMC 5.400; St. O 124.
- 5h. 1489, [Venice]: *Opera*, Bonus Accursius, rev. by Valerius Superchius: Math. Capcasa: H \*12145; BMC 5.597.
- 5i. 1492, Venice: *Opera*, Bonus Accursius: Laz. de Saviliano: HCR 12163; St. O 125.
- \*5j. 1493, Venice: *Opera*, [Bonus Accursius]: Chr. de Pensis: H 12147.
- \*5k. 1496, Venice: *Opera*, [Bonus Accursius]: Joh. de Tridino: H 12148.
- 5l. [1497/98], Venice: *Met.*, Bonus Accursius: Chr. de Pensis: HR 12162; BMC 5.471; St. O 167.

## 6. REGIUS

- 6a. 1492, Venice: *Met.*, [Bart. Merula]: [B. Locatellus for Oct. Scotus]: Graesse 5.75.
- 6b. 1493, Venice: *Met.*, Bart. Merula: B. Locatellus for Oct. Scotus: HC 12172; St. O 170.
- 6c. 1493, Venice: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: Bern. Benalius: H \*12170 = H 12155; St. O 171.
- 6d. 1493, Venice: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: Sim. Bevilaqua: HC \*12171; BMC 5.518; St. O 172.
- \*6e. [1494?, Venice]: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: [Joh. de Tridino]: Graesse 5.75.
- 6f. 1496, [Paris]: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: And. Bocard for Pierre Regnault: HC 12173; St. O 173.
- \*6g. 1496, Venice: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: [No Pr.]: HC 12174.

- \*6h. [No Date], Venice: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: [No Pr.]: BNC 128.629, no. 462.
- \*6i. 1497, Lyons: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: Jac. Maillet: H 12175; Lyons Cat. 12.452.
- 6j. 1497, Venice: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: Sim. Bevilaqua: HC \*12176; BMC 5.522; St. O 174.
- \*6k. 1498, Venice: *Met.*, [Raph. Regius]: Sim. Bevilaqua: H 12177.
- \*6l. 1499, Venice: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: [No Pr.]: C 2.4549.
- 6m. [ca. 1500, Venice]: *Met.*, Raph. Regius: [Epon. press]: H 12168; St. O 175.

From each group the first should be the most significant printing. With one exception, then (see below, pp. 230 f.), these earliest printings are regarded here as the actual first editions of their respective traditions and are therefore treated in some detail. Attention is also paid to those two editions which are the sources for the two dependent traditions (i.e., of Calderinus and Merula). No formal bibliographical description is given since such descriptions can usually be obtained from the bibliographies cited in the list above.

#### 1. PUTEOLANUS: BOLOGNA 1471

The first source-edition is the Bolognese *princeps* of 1471. This was the first major book from the press of Balthasar Azoguidus. The extant contract (October 25, 1470) between the editor on the one part and Azoguidus and Hannibal Malpiglius (who was actually in charge of the printing) on the other points out the obligations of an editor to a printer: “. . . Franciscus promissit . . . dare et tradere exemplum librorum imprimendorum seu stampandorum, que sint correcta et corrigere teneatur ipse dominus Franciscus pro posse suo et etiam pro posse suo . . . cum honestate dictos libros sic stampatos publicare et legere publice et conabitur quantum poterit dictos libros vendere seu vendi facere. . . .” The contract further provides that as compensation Puteolanus should receive a one-third share in the profits from the sale of the books.

Puteolanus in his letter of dedication to Cardinal Franciscus Gonzaga of Mantua leaves no doubt that the editorial work was his own when he refers to “*poemata Publii Ovidii nasonis nuper a me recognita . . .*,” and a case can be made out for regarding him as the chief of the contracting parties.<sup>6</sup> The Ovid, however, seems

<sup>6</sup> See L. Sighinolfi, “Francesco Puteolano e le origini della stampa in Bologna e in Parma,” *La Bibliofilia* 15 (1913) 262–266, 331–344, 383–392, 451–467. The contract is quoted on 455–456; the standing of Puteolanus is discussed *passim*.

to be the only recorded product of the agreement which was to run for two years. This may indicate that the edition was a financial failure, or that Puteolanus developed other interests, or it may merely mean that he was not willing to edit a series of authors in rapid sequence merely to keep the presses busy.<sup>7</sup>

Whatever the cause for Puteolanus' failure to contribute more to the press of Azoguidus, the edition of Ovid enjoyed some slight measure of popularity for the next decade. It was reprinted once with the dedicatory epistle by Augustinus Carnerius at Ferrara (Item 1b), and in 1480 Azoguidus printed it without the epistle (Item 1c). This last printing was also the final book from his press.

Variants characteristic of this edition and its reprints, which serve as internal evidence for their kinship, are represented by the following:<sup>8</sup>

	<i>Puteolanus</i>	<i>Celt.</i>
7.612	uirumque*	matrumque
7.764	pecorique	pecorumque
12.327	petreium*	phereum, petraeum
12.350	nedinium*	Nerlinum, nedimnum
12.588	ut has iam iam*	ubi Asiacas

## 2. ANDREAS: ROME 1471

The second source edition is the *editio princeps Romana*, likewise of the year 1471, edited by Joannes Andreas, Bishop of Aleria, who had been a student at Mantua of Vittorino da Feltre. He was the first librarian of the Vatican under Sixtus IV, and for his publishers, Sweynheym and Pannartz, edited in the course of five years (1468–1472) some twenty-one major works including the five volumes of *Postilla super totam Bibliam* by Nicolaus de Lyra.

He comments more than once upon the speed of his editorial work. He says, for example, in the epistle prefacing his *Epistolae divi Cypriani*:

Hoc certe tempore sudanti satis mihi in immenso Nicolai de Lyra super ueteris et noui testamenti ad litteram glossemate: ab impressoribus nostris qui biblie libros informabant: repente efflagitatus sum ut quoniam

<sup>7</sup> See A. Sorbelli, *Storia della Stampa in Bologna* (Bologna 1929) 9–10, for explanations which have been offered.

<sup>8</sup> Variants marked by an asterisk reappear in Item 3a which does not belong to this tradition of printings. See below, p. 226.

carta maior illos defecerat: ne officine eorum uacarent: quod nunquam fit absque ingenti artis dispendio: aliquid minoris uoluminis opus illis commodum expedirem. Res uisa mihi est: non parum difficultatis et aliquanto magis periculi habitura: ut propere et recte possem aliquid facere . . . perstiti tamen in uetere quodam instituto meo: melius esse iudicans a paucis de quisquiliis quibusdam reprehendi: quam a bonorum multitudine labores meos desiderari. . . . Conuerti me igitur plurimo incitatus ardore ad sublimis et animi et facundie uirum Dium Cyprianum . . . et eius epistolas in manibus sumpsit. . . .

And the same speed apparently went into the preparation of this complete edition of Ovid according to the explanation in his epistle to Paul II:

. . . Magnum. . . . Metamorphoseos opus . . . nos per estatem presentem quasi ludentes inter maiora Ciceronis orationum opera recognouimus: et parua quedam argumenta<sup>9</sup> fabularum principiis apposui. Si quis fortasse diligentius in ea re uigilauit: aut plenius quicquam ab antiquis traditum habet: exponat illud in publicum rogamus. Nos ipsi satis artati temporum angustiis necessitati potius paruimus: quam nostro desiderio. Cetera omnia Poete opera quanta possumus: congregamus: ut lenissimus Vates in duobus legi totus voluminibus possit.

Some impression of Andreas' position with relation to his printers can be gained from his letter in the fifth volume of de Lyra's *Postilla*, addressed to Pope Sixtus IV.<sup>10</sup> The tone of his plea for financial assistance for them seems to suggest that he also was playing the dominant role in the arrangement.

This edition of Ovid, despite the fact that its text of the *Metamorphoses* was based substantially upon the now respected *Codex Marcianus* 225, enjoyed no great popularity. Puteolanus' text survives until 1480 in the activity of Azoguidus. Andreas' text disappears almost with the sundering of the partnership between Sweynheym and Pannartz in 1473. John of Paderborn reprinted the *Metamorphoses* and Andreas' epistle at Louvain, sometime around 1475, but this one printing (Item 2b) is the only echo.

There are rather numerous unique variants, many of them printer's errors which John faithfully followed, among which these are typical:

<sup>9</sup> These are not the *argumenta* attributed to Lactantius. The quotation is from microfilm of a British Museum copy of Item 2a.

<sup>10</sup> Reprinted by Beriah Botfield in *Prefaces to the First Editions of the Greek and Roman Classics* (Cambridge 1861) 64-67.

	<i>Andreas</i>	<i>Cett.</i>
7.56	Achine	Achiuae
7.464	Thyren	Tyron, Tenon
12.306	Phodus	Pholus
12.327	uellere	euellere, tollere
12.526	fuerat	tunc est

### 3. [FEDERICUS DE COMITIBUS]: [VENICE 1472]

The third source-edition shares many readings characteristic of the edition of Puteolanus. It contains no indication of the name of its publisher nor of the place nor date of publication but is now usually assigned, on the basis of type used in his edition of Dante, to the work of one Federicus de Comitibus of Verona during the time when he was printing in Venice. The watermarks in the paper used, the printer's skill at type setting, and the known date of his edition of Propertius suggest that the edition of Ovid was probably issued before February of 1472 (cf. BMC 7.1134-1135). There are no annotations either at the beginning or at the end of the volume to indicate who was the editor or any of the other circumstances of preparation of the text.

This edition seems never to have been reprinted. At first glance it would appear to be a copy of the text of Puteolanus, but certain unusual variants distinguish it from all other *Ovids* printed before 1500:

	<i>F. de C.</i>	<i>Cett.</i>
3.351	Namque ter	Nam quater
7.464	ciprum	cypron
7.616	Aeginae asopidos olim	quondam asopidos eginae
7.741	pactus	tactus

In thirty-seven out of forty-five test passages which contain significant variants the text printed by Federicus agrees with that of Puteolanus. It seems necessary to conclude that either the two editors started from very similar MSS or else Federicus or his editor started with the text of Puteolanus and modified it by recourse to one or more new MSS.

### 4. CALPHURNIUS: VENICE 1474

The fourth source-edition, published at Venice by Jacobus Rubeus in 1474, was edited, according to the verse colophon, by



Joannes Calphurnius, whose edition of Calderinus' *Commentarii in Martialem et in Ibin Ovidii* was issued by the same publisher in the same year. The Ovid was printed during the two-year period when Puteolanus and Calphurnius were under contract to one another to maintain a school in Bologna.<sup>11</sup> The prose colophon repeats that of Puteolanus almost verbatim except for the name of the new publisher. And this is not all the common ground, for in only one of the forty-five test passages in which significant variants appear does the text of Calphurnius stand alone. That passage is *Met.* 3.224, where each source-edition has its peculiar reading. In thirteen passages Calphurnius' reading is followed by the later editors (Accursius or Regius or both), while in the other thirty-one it agrees with the text of Puteolanus (with which Accursius agrees twenty-three times and Regius fifteen). The complete collation of *Met.* 7 tells the same story, for the only unique variant seems to be *et* for *at* in 7.145.

It seems plausible to assume that Calphurnius set about his work with a copy of his colleague's text in hand, the margins of which he filled with readings from the MSS he consulted. His entire edition then would represent essentially a modified form of that by Puteolanus even down to the colophon.

This edition was reprinted twice (Items 4b and 4c), once by Jacobus Rubeus himself at Pinerolo whither he had moved in 1478 to escape the plague, and once over the mountains at Rostock. It seems to follow the person of its first printer, for while he undoubtedly maintained his Venetian business connections still he was not properly situated at Pinerolo to take full advantage of the market. In addition a competing edition was already in circulation from Milan.

Of the three passages collated here for all six source-editions, the first shows a unique variant in the text of Calphurnius, the other two show typical agreements with other editions:

<i>Editor</i>	<i>3.224</i>	<i>7.115</i>	<i>12.121</i>
Puteol.	agrydos	illos	iisdem
Andreas	Egyalos	illos	iisdem
F. de C.	agriodes	illos	iisdem
Calph.	agrodos	ullos	iisdem
Accurs.	agriodos	ullos	idem
Regius	agliodos	ullos	idem

<sup>11</sup> For this contract see Sighinolfi (above, note 5) 456-457.

## 5. ACCURSIUS: MILAN 1475

The competing edition, the fifth source-edition, is that published first at Milan by Philippus de Lavagnia in 1475 with Bonus Accursius Pisanus as editor. It is the ancestor of the *editio tertia Veneta* of Magnus. Bonus Accursius edited for the same publisher in the same year the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* in terms of a contract whereby he was to receive sixty gold ducats from de Lavagnia for furnishing and correcting a manuscript for press purposes. Extant also is a contract dated March 9, 1475, by which he engages himself for a one-year period, at the start, as press reader of all the works of rhetoric or poetry to be printed by de Lavagnia.<sup>12</sup>

Bonus Accursius in his dedicatory letter to the Ducal Secretary Cicchus Simoneta clearly claims the text of Ovid as his own, saying "Pu. Ovidium Nasonem [*sic*] metamorphoseon mea opera correctum atque emendatum imprimendum curauit." He then justifies his inclusion of the *argumenta* of the so-called Lactantius:

Verum cum diligentius quaererem: quae prisci scriptores litteris mandauerunt: incidi in Coelium firmianum Lactantium Placidum: . . . Cuius ego ingenium non potui equidem non mirari: Nam incredibili quadam breuitate fabulam quanque complectitur: et interpretatur. Quae omnia ita in hoc opere inserui: ut nimiam pulchritudinem prae se ferant.<sup>13</sup>

This edition seems to have outranked all others in popularity until that of Regius appeared on the market, for at least eight reprints of it bearing the name of Accursius as editor followed the Milan edition. (This number includes a revised edition edited by Valerius Superchius in 1489.) Two reasons for the popularity may be suggested. First, it was a rather carefully printed edition, at least by comparison with the two early Venetian editions (F. de Comitibus and Calphurnius), and the presence of the *argumenta* may have made it more attractive than the simple text editions. But, second, it would appear that it was placed in the hands of printers who were able to take much more advantage of the Venetian market than the obscure Federicus de Comitibus (who had immediately moved away to Iesi) and Jacobus Rubeus who had left in 1478 for Pinerolo.

There is a related tradition of three printings (Items 5b, 5d, and 5e) all of which appeared in Parma between 1477 and 1480, the

<sup>12</sup> For excerpts from these contracts see BMC 6.xxi.

<sup>13</sup> The excerpts given here are quoted from Item 5f.

first by Stephanus Corallus, the second by an unknown printer who had worked in Corallus' shop, and the third by Andreas Portilia. The distinguishing mark of these books, by printers whose business connections are somewhat interlocking, is the inclusion of a brief note by Domitius Calderinus concerning the reason for Ovid's exile. This note occurs previously in Calderinus' 1474 edition of the *Commentarii in Ovidii Ibin*.<sup>14</sup> There is actually no claim in so many words that Calderinus edited these texts, although Dibdin toyed with the idea, and at least one library catalogue has fallen into the trap.<sup>15</sup>

The "Calderinus" printings are virtually identical in text with the Accursius printings and likewise present the *argumenta* of the so-called Lactantius. A few unique variants can be cited for the entire group, but this Accursius tradition follows closely in the textual pattern of the Calphurnius edition and is, in turn, followed rather closely by the text of the Regius editions; therefore unique variants are comparatively rare. Here are examples:<sup>16</sup>

	<i>Accursius</i>	<i>Celt.</i>
3.465	inde	deinde
7.186a	sopitis	sopite, sopito
7.537	feries	feris
12.268	fingitur	figitur
12.329	corpora	robora

## 6. REGIUS: VENICE 1493

The sixth source-edition contains the commentary of Raphael Regius. There are, in a sense, two source-editions since the first two printings (in 1492 and 1493) were illegal and therefore constitute a special group. The first illegal printing bears no trace of any

<sup>14</sup> For a description of this edition (Rome, September 7, 1474) see *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke* 6.42-43.

<sup>15</sup> Dibdin, in *An Introduction to the Knowledge of Rare and Valuable Editions of the . . . Classics*, 4th ed. (London 1827) 2.262, merely says, ". . . The editor appears to have been Domitius Calderinus." Dibdin then presents two suggestions about the ancestry of the edition: "It is considered to be a reprint either of the first Roman edition of 1471 [Item 2a], or of the Venetian edition of 1474 [Item 4a]; and may be pronounced to be a rare book." BNC 128 (s. n. "Ovide") actually says of our Item 5d, "*Metamorphoses*, edente Domitio Calderino."

<sup>16</sup> The "Calderinus" printings and certain of the later Accursius printings show a tendency to acquire readings not in their source-edition. The twelve printings grouped here will require much attention before the details of their filiation can be firmly established. (Item 5e, for example, occasionally echoes, in its readings, the text of Puteolanus and Item 5d seems, curiously, to anticipate a few readings otherwise unique in the Regius texts.)

editor's signature or any indication of the publisher's identity, but the second contains a brief dedicatory letter addressed to Franciscus, son of Georgius Cornelius, and signed by Bartholomeus Merula, while Bonetus Locatellus signs himself as printer of the work for Octavianus Scotus.

Merula's account (in Item 6b) of how he happened to issue an edition with Regius' notes is casual:

. . . Superioribus diebus summi uiri nonnulli: et de me quam optime meriti: quibus nihil poteram negare: ad me: ut scis: attullere [*sic*] nonnulla metamorphoseos Ouidii carmina interpretanda: quod quamuis diu recusassem: non potui tamen ulla ratione efficere: quin onus hoc subirem: ut et amicis morem gererem: et enarrationes illae iam diu intermissae prodirent in lucem: quo praeclarissimum opus: et perquam necessarium ad poetarum intelligentiam ab omnibus posset intelligi: et a te potissimum: cuius fabulae te mirum in modum delectant: Enarrationes igitur illas postremas tibi dedicaui: . . .<sup>17</sup>

Merula who published his own commentaries on many other works of Ovid, as well as on Persius, Ausonius, and Curtius Rufus, makes, of course, no effort to claim this work as his own and is careful to head the commentary thus, "*Raphaeli Regii in Metamorphosin Ouidii enarrationes.*" But the anger of Regius over the premature printings and his legal action against both Merula and the publisher seem to have brought the illegal tradition to an end in June of 1493. By the end of the same year Bernardinus Benalius had issued the first legal printing, and Simon Bevilaqua had followed with a second. The early legal printings regularly bear at the end an epistle to Antonius Buldunus, Ioannes Franciscus Paschalicus, and Dominicus Bollanus (the "*eloquentissimi aduocatores*" who had represented him) which reflects Regius' ire against Merula, that "*fatuus*" and "*ab omni humanitate alienus*" who had treacherously and inaccurately published his *enarrationes* which he had carefully prepared "*ad communem studiorum utilitatem*," and against the publisher who had been careless as well.

Despite the ire of Regius, a collation reveals that for long passages the textual differences between the first illegal and legal printings are so slight that there is no real need to treat them as separate traditions.<sup>18</sup> It is undoubtedly best, however, to take the

<sup>17</sup> Quoted from microfilm of the copy in the Harvard College Library.

<sup>18</sup> Differences between the Ovidian texts are comparatively hard to find in the collation of *Met. 7*, for example, possibly since Regius' text can be reconstructed substantially from his commentary. But the commentary of Regius in its legal form often doubles in volume that sent by Merula to the printer; so Regius was probably justified in feeling that his commentary had been badly treated.

legal printing of Benalius as the source-edition and to treat the two by Locatellus (Items 6a and 6b) as rather inaccurate copies even though they are earlier in point of time.

Eleven printings of the legal edition had appeared by the end of the century. Its popularity was such that none of its older competitors among the source-texts seems to have been reprinted after 1500. That it was printed in Venice from the start, one of the great centers of the book trade, undoubtedly helped its spread, but the fact that it was the first edition with commentary (and with a commentary that met the needs of its time) might have guaranteed popularity regardless of where it was printed. It was published also in Paris and Lyons before 1500 and had been published close to sixty times in France and Italy by the end of the next century.

Typical unique variants are tabulated:

	<i>Regius</i>	<i>Celt.</i>
3.465	negabo	rogabo
7.13	an	aut
7.769	frequentes	sequentes
12.255	pelathes	belathes

Occasionally the illegal text differs from the legal:

	<i>Illegal</i>	<i>Legal</i>
7.464	tenon, siphnon	tyron, cypron
12.127	nemetæ	menetæ
12.460	pyramon	pyramon

These six editions (Items 1a, 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, and 6c), prepared, respectively, by Puteolanus, Andreas, Federicus de Comitibus, Calphurnius, Accursius, and Regius as editor or publisher, are the basic fifteenth century editions of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Their identity has been established in part from external marks like commentaries and editor's epistles but much more certainly from inherent textual characteristics. In them a text critic may search for MS readings<sup>19</sup> and the emendations of Renaissance scholars, and from them descend not only the twenty other printings already examined but probably every other fifteenth century printing that will ever be found.

<sup>19</sup> Much more exact and extensive collations of MS readings than those provided by Magnus and Slater are needed before it will be at all possible to identify the precise MSS used by these Renaissance editors. Magnus is right in pointing out the extensive dependence of Andreas' text upon the codex Marcianus 225 (or something very similar). It is difficult to get beyond his suggestions in his edition (p. 629) concerning the sources for Accursius' text of the *argumenta* attributed to Lactantius. In any event, all editions except that of Andreas seem to lean most heavily upon MSS which belong to family X in the usual classification.