

nocturnal venture to his mistress in Tibur, Propertius concludes with a meditation on the proper status of a poet's tomb. Cynthia's genethliacon prays for frozen time: may her beauty (*forma*) be everlasting (*perennis*), her reign over the poet eternal and these rituals annual. But *forma*, as the last duet of poems proves, is a highly evanescent endowment. Its disappearance should strike fear into Cynthia as it does final scorn in the poet (3.25.17-18):

has tibi fatalis cecinit mea pagina diras:
eventum formae disce timere tuae!

The road to immortality, that ultimate illusion of genius, lies through poetry for his material and for its creator (3.1.23-24):

omnia post obitum fingit maiora vetustas:
maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora venit.

Propertius' page is from the muses, whatever its contents, and as a *vatis* he can predict its endurance as well as Rome's moral breakdown or Cynthia's withering age (3.1.35-36):

meque inter seros laudabit Roma nepotes:
illum post cineres auguror ipse diem.²⁰

The defiance time's variousness presents human goals is a theme that unifies Propertius and Tullus, each in his different sphere. For Tullus, return to Rome betokens espousal on the ethical level of what Propertius lays claim to on the aesthetic. The autonomous purposes of history and poetry, fact and imagination for once supplement each other. Propertius' renunciation of epic to maintain his stand as an elegist of breadth parallels Tullus' foregoing of an imperial Rome bolstered by dogmatic arms to accept the urban civilities of political and familial life. Each will have his *nepotes*—those who in a later time will sing the praises of Propertius' poetic accomplishment or those more literal creatures who will carry on Tullus' name into the future. Tullus is more fortunate than Augustus who loses his Marcellus (genealogy, the poet matter-of-factly observes in elegy 18, gave him little help in the face of death). He is more felicitous still in that, like Cynthia, he was befriended by a poet. In spite of Propertius' yearning for the one and seeming repulsion of the other, it is the strange excellence of his verse that has earned for them both, as well as for himself, their fragile yet continued triumph over mortality.

Brown University

²⁰ R. J. Baker, among others, has discussed in detail Propertius' grasping at eternity in "Propertius III, i, 1-6 again. Intimations of Immortality?" *Mnemosyne* 21 (1968), 35-39. See also Nethercut, *op. cit. passim*.

19

Studies on the Naples Ms. IV F 3 of Ovid's *Metamorphoses**

WILLIAM S. ANDERSON

For just over 85 years now, since Alexander Riese published his collation of the ms., scholars have recognized the fundamental importance of the Naples ms. IV F 3 for the constitution of the text of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*.¹ A few years earlier, Riese had produced a competent edition of Ovid's poem, relying on the standard mss. used in that period. A trip to Naples led to careful study of IV F 3 and recognition of its significance, and so he brought out a second edition of his text in 1889, providing a full collation of IV F 3 (henceforth called N by scholars) and cogently arguing for its value. Hugo Magnus, the most diligent student of the text of the *Met.* since Riese, rapidly applied the materials supplied by Riese. Already planning his own major edition of the *Met.*, Magnus began publishing in 1891 a series of studies on the early fragments and basic mss. which would provide the foundation for his own text. In 1894 he issued two studies, one in which he cogently presented the data for assuming a common source (which he christened O) for N and the hitherto *codex optimus*, Laurentianus Marcianus Florentinus 225 (regularly called M); the other demonstrated that N could not be a direct copy of M, but must be regarded as an independent derivative of O which could provide both confirmatory readings for M and correct readings where M was corrupt.² In 1901 Magnus himself visited Naples to check N in numerous places.³

* I wish to express my special gratitude to my colleague Professor Charles Murgia for his helpful criticisms.

¹ A. Riese in his edition of the *Metamorphoses* (Leipzig, 1889).

² H. Magnus, "Studien zur Überlieferung und Kritik der Metamorphosen Ovids: III Die Familie O," *NJB* 149 (1894) 191-207; "IV Marcianus und Neapolitanus," *NJB* 149 (1894) 637-655, 759-799.

³ So stated by Magnus, p. XIV of his edition (Berlin, 1914).

Thus, the massive edition of the *Met.* which he published in 1914 improved on Riese's report and above all laid out in the apparatus the evidence for the relation of M and N. Since then, no new work has appeared on N. Slater's valuable apparatus criticus to the *Met.*, conceived in antagonism to Magnus, ignores his rival and borrows the data on N from the collation of Riese.⁴ However, because he could not match Heinsius' data on variant readings with Riese's report, Slater garbled the data on the correcting hands in N; he cannot be trusted anywhere where he assigns a reading to N².⁵

In preparing a new edition of the *Met.*, I have compiled some corrected and some new information on N. The purpose of this paper is to assemble this information in one place for other scholars, in the hope that the data can be used even more searchingly than I myself have done. I shall begin with a description of certain features of N which have been incorrectly reported or need fresh discussion. Then, I shall discuss a ms. which I have found to be a copy of N, the first and only one so far discovered. Finally, I shall consider the possible connections between N and the ms. that Slater rediscovered and named U, Vaticanus Urbinas latinus 341.

I. STAGES IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF N

Of over four hundred known mss. of the *Met.*, only two were copied in Southern Italy at a time when the Beneventan script prevailed: N and U. When Riese rediscovered N, the script, then known as Lombard (*litterae longobardicae*), had not yet received thorough study. Using the criteria then available, Riese dated N in the 11th century; and he was followed by Magnus and he in turn by Ehwald. However, in 1905 E. A. Loew published his definitive *Beneventan Script*, in which he assembled a dated catalogue of all examples of the script known to him. Loew dated N in the 12th century, and his authority has been accepted by subsequent scholars such as Slater and Bruère.⁶ In the past two years, Loew's dating has been challenged by two Italian specialists, who would like to put N back in the last quarter of the 11th century.

⁴ So stated by Slater (Oxford, 1927), p. 8.

⁵ "superest ut moneam diversas quae in eo (N) plurimae servantur lectiones plenius esse ab Heinsio quam ab aliis citatas. has cum aliter distinguere non vacaverit, plures a manu recentiori esse scito: quas commemorare ab re esse visum est, ne aliunde citari debeant; modo appareat talia fonte alio derivata in marginibus Neapolitani confluisse." (p. 24).

⁶ See Loew, p. 354, number 151; R. T. Bruère, "The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*," *HSCP* 50 (1939), p. 97.

Loew distinguished a special regional kind of Beneventan script which, after the largest city with which it was associated, he called the Bari-type. At the beginning, the Bari-type could be considered a direct offshoot of what was developing around Monte Cassino, and so Loew reasonably postulated a time lag between Monte Cassino and Bari, roughly 25 years. One challenge to Loew comes from a scholar who believes that that lag of 25 years did not continue to exist in the late 11th century, because by then Bari would have developed an independent scriptorium or rather scriptoria.⁷ Another challenge comes from Bertelli, who has been doing his research into the marginal illustrations of N, the first known illustrations in any ms. of the *Met.*⁸ Bertelli believes that the data he has assembled on these illustrations permit a date in the latter part of the 11th century. If the date of N is brought back into the 11th century, that will make it a close contemporary of M, as many would prefer. But whether N was written in the 11th century or the early 12th, since it preserves eight more lines of Book 14 than M (written in the mid-11th century), it is clear that it is independent of M.

We do not know where N was or who used it for about 400 years after its original writing in the neighborhood of Bari. However, since it next shows up in Naples, it is reasonable to assume that it had remained in Southern Italy throughout this period. From a dedication in the ms., we learn that Giano Anisio, who lived until nearly the middle of the 16th century, gave it as a present to his friend Antonio Seripando. Seripando also acquired two other mss. of the *Met.* by the will of another friend. A century later, all three were in the possession of the Library of S. Giovanni a Carbonara, and there Heinsius made his collation of N.⁹ Riese rediscovered N in the Biblioteca Nazionale another two centuries later. It has recently been cared for by the Center for Restoration at Grottaferrata, but is now readily accessible, as it was for me in 1974.

The original scribe of N made a good many errors. One of the most frequent was the omission of a line or lines. Fortunately, he himself often caught the error and added the missing line or lines either between the lines in the proper sequence or in the margin. In some cases, later

⁷ G. Cavallo, "La trasmissione dei testi nell'area beneventano-cassinense," to appear in *Settimane di studio sull'alto medioevo*, 32.

⁸ C. Bertelli, "L'illustrazione di testi classici nell'area beneventana," *ibid.*

⁹ Heinsius worked on N in May 1647. I have not been able to identify Antonio Seripando, but I suspect that he may be a close relative of, if not identical with Gerolamo (later Troiano) Seripando (1493-1563) who founded the Library of S. Giovanni a Carbonara in 1551. When Charles of Bourbon took over Naples in 1734, he added that Library to the Farnese and Palatine Libraries to form the Royal Library, the nucleus of what is now the National Library at Naples.

hands have made the correction, which escaped the original scribe. Two correctors are quite identifiable, who have worked their way through the 14 books which N preserves from its source. The older corrector also used the Beneventan script and made his changes in N some time before the mid-12th century, I would assume. His characteristic practice was to erase or overmark the original writing, and, since he was working from an inferior ms., his "corrections" are not always improvements. Thanks to the existence of M and the known relationship between M and N, it is often possible to rectify the damage done by N² and restore to N a reading found in M. I shall discuss N² in greater detail when I consider the possible lines of relationship between N and U. The third principal hand, that is the later corrector, may readily be distinguished from the others by his obvious Italian style, which places him in the 13th century. His characteristic practice was not to tamper with the original, but to write above it alternative readings which he presumably copied from another ms. As one might suspect, the alternatives rarely improve on N, except in the case of manifest error; most of the superscripta of N³ reveal that the ms. which was being used was considerably inferior to N. Any scribal hand later than N³ I have labeled N⁴.

Riese stated in his description of N that ff. 82v.-90v. (= 7.4-488) had been written by another hand. He did not mean a later hand, but a different contemporary hand. Magnus was the first to question this distinction, and Munari still regards the matter as unsettled. Plate 3 shows f. 86v. (7.242-271); its writing may be compared with Plates 5 and 7, which illustrate the standard scribal hand in portions of Book 9. Although there is a general similarity in forms of individual letters, the total impression of the hand in 7.242 ff. is different from that of Book 9, because it is more open. That impression may be documented by measuring the lines. According to my calculations, the average line in Book 9 is under 7 cm. long; some lines are less than 6 cm. and the average is roughly 7.5 cm.; the longest line extends 9 cm., compared to a maximum of 8 cm. in the principal scribal hand. On the basis of these data, I believe that Riese was justified in positing a different (though contemporary) hand.

Riese also noted that f. 103 (= 8.340-402) was the work of another hand. Whether he meant it or not, he implied that the *same* hand produced ff. 82v.-90v. and 103. That cannot be accepted. The scribe of 103, as can be seen from the letter forms, is clearly distinguishable from the scribe of 82v.-90v. Moreover, he writes 29 lines per page instead of the 31 of the adjoining ms., 82-90; and much of the remainder of N has 30 lines per page. Then, too, the functions of the scribes differ. Since 82v.

is written by the first hand of N, and 82v.-90v. continue in the same style with the same kind of text, it is evident that the second scribe was simply continuing for a brief space the work of the main scribe until he was ready to resume his task on 91r. By contrast, f. 103 is a leaf crudely added to N to supply in part a lacuna in O: 8.340-402, lines missing in both M and N. In N, the evidence is unmistakable: reaching 8.339 in the middle of f. 104r., the original scribe continued without pause on 8.403 ff. Thus, the inserted leaf interrupts the sequence at the bottom of f. 102v., and the scribe of f. 103 has had to mark the point where we should start reading the new leaf, before going on to 8.403 at the middle of f. 104r.¹⁰

The same Beneventan hand inserted ff. 161-162 after 13.138 to remedy other omissions in O, the archetype of both M and N. On 161r. he first added the 5 lines 8.398-402 which he could not crowd into the earlier f. 103. Then, leaving the space of one line, he copied 8.597-608. Since there was still room on 161r., he started with 13.276 and continued on 161v. and 162r. with the passage through 343. He left 162v. blank.

Riese also correctly noted the facts about the ending of Book 14. Since these facts have unfortunately been badly garbled by misinformation that Magnus published in 1894 and that his prestige made acceptable to all later scholars including Slater and Munari in his catalogue, I think it important to restate them and document them with a photograph. Riese stated that the original hand of N ceased at the bottom of f. 188v. (= 14.838), that the remainder of Book 14, namely the thirteen lines 839-851 were continued on f. 189r. in *another Beneventan hand*.¹¹ He went on to point out that, after an interval of considerable time—it would be at least a century—another scribe started to copy Book 15 on the bottom half of f. 189r. and that several hands can be distinguished at work, all late, in Book 15 of our ms. A glance at Plate 9 will prove Riese correct. The top half of the page clearly contains Beneventan script, whereas the bottom half was the product of a later Italian hand.

In 1894 Magnus published the first of his important studies on N.¹² Seeking to define as fully as possible the nature of the common archetype O of M and N, he listed the major common errors of M and N. As is well known, M stops with 14.830 at the bottom of f. 119r. and leaves 119v. blank: the fact suggests that the ms. copied by M's scribe was also incomplete after that point. When Magnus read Riese's description, he suspected

¹⁰ In fact, since O's leaf contained more lines than the average leaf of N, the scribe of f. 103 managed to write only 8.340-397, and he finished the other 5 lines of the passage at the start of inserted f. 161 (as I note below). A later hand has then added the missing 5 lines at the bottom of f. 103v.

¹¹ Riese, p. xxx.

¹² Magnus, "Die Familie O" (above, n. 2).

a connection between the incomplete M and N, and he asked a friend of his, O. Schroeder, to check the Neapolitan ms. on f. 189r. Schroeder did so, or said he did, and wrote Magnus that Riese had erred, that *the same later hand* produced the entire set of lines on 189r., both the last thirteen lines of Book 14 and the first lines of Book 15 (as well as the additional lines on 189v.).¹³ On the basis of Schroeder's misinformation, which Magnus failed to check in 1901 even when he was in Naples to study N firsthand, Magnus worked out a theory about O that, in modified forms, has continued to fascinate scholars ever since. The unexamined assumption is, that the ms. N copied absolutely broke off at 14.838 and that such was the condition of O. By the time that the parent of M copied O, eight more lines had been lost from the presumably worn and mutilated final leaf, and consequently the parent of M preserved Book 14 only through line 830. Now that Riese's original information has been proved accurate, not only must all descriptions of f. 189r. and the end of Book 14 in N—see Magnus, Ehwald, Slater, Munari—be correspondingly altered, but also scholars must carefully study the Beneventan writing of f. 189r. and reconsider the whole problem of the likely extent of Book 14 in N's parent and thence of the putative condition of O when copied.

There is no doubt, I think, that a different Beneventan hand produced 14.839–851 from the hand at work earlier in Book 14: the letter-forms are quite distinct from those of 188v. The new hand is not the same as that isolated by Riese in 7.4–488, nor does it even remotely resemble the hand that supplied ff. 103 and 161–162. It is however, in my opinion, closer in style and time to the scribes of 7.4–488 and the principal scribe of N, and we are obliged, I suggest, to ask ourselves whether the new scribe on f. 189r. was merely taking over from the tired principal scribe and continuing to copy the same quite legible ms. through the end of Book 14 or whether, as Magnus supposed (though from different data), the parent of N absolutely ended at 14.838, and the new scribe on f. 189r. used another ms. to complete the book. Two additional facts need to be weighed in the conclusion. First, f. 189 seems to have been ruled by the original Beneventan scribes or designed carefully to fit their regular system of 31 lines per page. All folia that can be shown otherwise to have been added later have a different number of lines. Secondly, no corrections or glosses from N² are discernible on 189r. (The last Beneventan gloss occurs at 824 above *Iliaden*.) This might mean that N² has finished Book 14 or that the scribe of 14.839–851 performed his task shortly after N² went through the ms. In the latter case, the value of 14.839–851 in the

¹³ P. 197, n. 3.

Neapolitan ms. would be approximately the same as that of the Beneventan corrections in earlier portions of N; it definitely must be differentiated from the much later text of Book 15, which is of negligible value. In the former case, the hypothesis about the end of O must be modified. It seems to me more likely that a leaf containing 14.831–851 was lost in O—if that is the explanation to be adopted—than that eight lines were somehow removed by a convenient rip, before M's parent copied O.

So far, I have discussed the leaves where a Beneventan hand other than the principal scribe of N has been at work. I now come to two leaves where a late hand supplied a defect in N due apparently to the poor condition of the ms. itself and the consequent loss of leaves near the beginning. There is no corresponding difficulty in M, and hence we may assume the integrity of O at these two points. Two different scribes have supplied the missing leaves: f. 7 (= 1.198–255), and f. 19 (= 2.121–181).¹⁴ I believe that the original leaves were lost after the 13th century and that we have a means of recovering with some confidence their readings. I base this belief on my recent discovery of an unsuspected copy of N, to which I now turn my attention.

II. LAURENTIANUS 36.5 AND N

When Slater began to use the collations of Nicolaas Heinsius which had been found in the Bodleian Library at the end of the 19th century, he recognized the importance of three mss., Heinsius' *primus Palatinus*, *Urbinas*, and *Berneggerianus*; and he was able to locate the first two in the Vatican collections, the third in Paris. He added the collations of these three to the usual report of Ovid's mss. and considerably improved the accuracy of data on which one could assess the ms. tradition and select the most likely reading. As he sifted through other collations left by Heinsius, Slater was particularly impressed by what Heinsius called *Vaticanus primus* (later identified by Slater as *Vaticanus latinus* 1593) and *Mediceus quintus*. The latter he could not identify, but he strongly urged future scholars, if they could locate it, to collate it carefully.¹⁵ The process of identifying Heinsius' mss. has been long, but not without results.¹⁶ In the case of *Mediceus quintus*, there have been a number of

¹⁴ The lines contained in these two missing leaves approximate the usual average of 60 per leaf that we find in N, not the longer lineage of O that we can reconstruct from the losses in Books 8 and 13. Plate 1 shows f. 19r. of N (2.121–150).

¹⁵ Slater, p. 16, n. 1: "*Vaticanus* 1593 et *Mediceus Quintus* si inveniatur, passim, nisi fallor, conferendi."

¹⁶ The main contributions since those of Slater have been made by F. Munari, *Ovidiana* (Paris, 1958), 347–349; H. Boese, *Philologus* 106 (1962) 155–173; F. W. Lenz, *Eranos* 61 (1963) 98 ff.; and now M. Reeve, *RM* 117 (1974) 133–166.

obstacles. Heinsius left his collation of the ms. in *Bodl. Auct. S. V. 8*, describing the ms. as follows: "R. codex optimus; quintus Mediceus DC annorum: multa tamen recentiori manu scripta ab initio lib. XI, Eurydicenque suam" (= 11.66). The index of collations in *Auct. S. V. 8* is not, however, accurate in its ordinal numbers, for it lists two mss. as "quartus" before introducing Mediceus quintus. The ms. to which Heinsius referred in that index may confidently be identified with Laur. 36.5, for Heinsius wrote on 36.5: "Contuli N.H. R Sextus R." And indeed one 13th century hand wrote 1.1-11.66, and the remainder of the poem was completed by a totally different second hand (using a different source of clearly inferior value). To complicate matters still more, Heinsius evaluated all his Medicean mss. before preparing his printed edition, and he decided that R (or Laur. 36.5) was better than all but the considerably older Laur. 36.12. Hence, Mediceus sextus, erroneously named quintus in *Auct. S. V. 8*, became secundus Mediceus in the printed edition.¹⁷ Thus, the first half of Slater's recommendation was fulfilled: Mediceus quintus was identified. It has remained for someone to collate Laur. 36.5, and that I have done.¹⁸

My collation has established that Laur. 36.5 deserved to be called "codex optimus" only because it was a direct copy of the excellent ms. N. Let me demonstrate this conclusion very rapidly by a partial list of the common errors of the two mss. Book 1.77 possit 138 per 178 ille 193 monticule 275 auxiliantibus 284 Infremuit 302 in 325 videt 326 *in marg.* 363 possem formare 397 nocebat 404 si 454 victa 481 *in marg.* 492 densis abolentur 519 licet 521 opifexque 528 *int. lin.* 537 compressus et ipse 558 habebit 602 speciem 636 *in marg.* 641 seseque exterrita 646 patriis dat et oscula 655 erat 677 veit 710 consilium 733 loqui 747 niligera 748 Hinc Book 2.69 ferat pavere 114 Defugiunt 214 loquor 238 sparsis 256 vocant 262 siccae quoque 318 laceri late 326 fatum 366 spectanda 398 trementes 402 Inquirens ne 456 rivus versabat harenas 465 decedere 470 avertit 526 sumat 584 Tangere 587 alta 620 suppositis 632 considerare 640 fatidicos 655 respirat 658 praevertitur 682 et septem 703 erant et erant 764 habundet 774 deae ad 783 brevibus 790 adopertaque et nubibus 827 venit 836 Set vocat Book 3.15 longe 26 ministris 72 Tunc 88 sedebat 134 natos natusque 142 quid enim 162 distinctus 175 *int. lin.* 242 latratibus 247 videri 284 quantusve 299 vultumque 358 prior 384 -que 388 silvis 418 at stupet 428 nisus 443 et *om.* 445 longum . . . in aevum 448 nec me 504 Tunc 545 frondibus 667 velatas . . . hastas 672 corpore deprenso Book 4.34

¹⁷ I am combining the partial results achieved by Munari and Lenz.

¹⁸ I studied Laur. 36.5 at the Laurentian Library in April 1974; subsequently, I have used a microfilm to check details.

Adducunt 57 continuas 101 relinquit 160 caedis et pullos luctibus 193 laudataque 269 illa sua 316 optabat 328 Si nulla 441 ipse nec 446 *in marg.* 564 laborum 603 Quodque pr. fuerant 674 trepido 676 exiguae 712 abiit at 746 Concipitque Book 5.40 asparsit 64 sunt 65 efato 142 gravi est 200 poenam 245 nec enim tibi finis 246 Detractes 301 Hauxerunt 374 et mecum 389 ammovet ictus 424 medio caractere cepit 465 et ni 499 Adveor 509 ut audivit 522 mea filia digna est. 526 neque enim nobis . . . pudori est 566 Nunc est regnorum 586 magnusque 649 avertitur Book 6.18 Tunc affuit 37 tardaue 58 percussus 92 bella 107 At 113 igneus 119 equum te sensit avem 161 crines 259 se qui iaculatus 261 improfectura 272 cum voce 312 marmore manat 314 cultu propensius 322 fessos 349 est *om.* 360 Quos 374 sed tunc 429 non illis gratia lecti 472 corpora 477 Proque sua 524 Inclusit 550 huic 629 ex nimia 630 vultum 646 strident 652 arcessite 690 et tristia 691 Et 697 subeo 698 Suppono Book 7.33 et *om.* 55 Maximus est intra me deus 69 vocas 89 Utque 92 non ignorantia 96 futura 133 vultus animumque 157 arte reportans 174 sinit 186 stertunt 188 et iam sua 226 placidas 247 Hereaque [Plates 3 and 4] 264 receptas 265 Seminaque et flores et 267 quos oceani reflui maris unda relavit 282 Et 284 flores et 319 Ut 320 balatus 408 lethei memorabant dentibus 421 ignarus 453 Et 547 plangor 554 flammaque faceque 555 *in marg.* 556 trepidisque 563 quisquam 571 hauriet illas 595 inspectato 658 animis annisque 665 *in marg.* 669 gerebant 711 est nunc 729 et oportuit 813 nenias Book 8.5 spectatos 9 sub vertice 14 vocalibus 19 bellum 40 ad gnosis 65 enim modo 77 nec huc 123 Capta 146 haliotos in alis 166 Et dubias 172 superata 179 Iam misit 199 visuque 203 medio quo 231 sed nec pater 277 Invidiosus 280 Aut inhonoratae 295 florentis 298 nec magnis 329 exciderat 339-416 *hoc ordine*: 339.403-415, 340-402.416 [340-402 *om.* N, *suppl.* N²] 353 ferrumque 372 corpora 396 iuvenis 419 adversis venabulum condidit armis 422 feram 432 tendunt sua 433 Pone aie 441 Toxia 444 recalescit 467 nescio quis 522 ignesque 527 scissosque 531 duri 537 tangunt refoventque 539 Post cineres 549 *inter lin.* 594 Protulit 633 favendo 637 parvos 641 Inde 658 consueverant 676 Et purpuratis 703 dum 705 digna do quod petitis¹⁹ 709 hora duos sedes 714 Inciperent 729 nota et (in s.s.) hoc 753 retrahi se videt 781 gravibus 787 horrida 812 sentire famem mestosque 815 vecta 818 Noctis eum 845 Tu quoque 870 habiit 872 tradidit illa 873 habibat Book 9.40 murmure venti 72 hedere 79 suis 119 parentem²⁰ 143 mox inde 157 ille [Plates 5 and 6] 168 frustra aut 183 Busirim indomui

¹⁹ It appears that the scribe has tried to make sense of N by changing *qui* to *quod*.

²⁰ Laur. 36.5 here shows the original reading, I believe, of N¹, also given by F. (See below p. 268) Burman reported the reading of a Medicean ms. (perhaps wrongly 36.5) as *parentem*.

203 possunt 207 gemitum 214 tremet 243 voluntas 291 horror adit 301 *in marg.* 318 corpus levare 359 facti 369 foliis quod adhuc licet 414 A Iove 427 Turvida [Plates 7 and 8] 432 non armis 482-485 *in marg.* 493 tecum sortita 531 pudet ad te credere 552 Fas sit ut 578 quod si 584 secto 604 quam nostrae cera tabellae 611 Apte non adiit 635 cum tota byblida 636 tenero de pectore 646 undam 647 iugum 681 mandavit 718 actas formaque fuit 724 desperet 749 amantem 784 crepuit resonabile Book 10.18 creatur 34 est haec 43 cerpsere 56 *in marg.* 65 portare 83 populo 158 terre 193 sustentant 252 urit 264 gemmas longoque monilia 309 panchaica 318 myrra tibi dum 327 iniit 349 metuis sacro 386 sciditque 393 roganti 396 mea non est 493 init 495 constrinxerat 557 pressitque gramen 591 planctis 653 libet arenam 693 vota sacerdos 697 An stigas sontes dubitavit mergere in undas 706 Quae . . . praebent Book 11.7 astam 16 inflato 26 Ut 37 minaces 39 et in illo 46 silvae dimissis 57 et sparso 66 tutus.

I shall not burden the argument with a list of readings where Laur. 36.5 has the correct reading in key passages along with N. The reader need only examine Plates 3-8 to determine how faithfully the scribe of Laur. 36.5 has performed his task with the Beneventan original. This extensive total agreement in errors (and similar agreement in significant correct readings, which I spare the reader) proves the close relationship of N¹ and Laur. 36.5. The special marks of disorder in Laur. 36.5 at 8.339 ff. show that it adapted the clumsy addition by N² of f. 103. Study of the Plates 3 through 8 will further demonstrate that Laur. 36.5 has copied the Beneventan changes and glosses of N³ (about which I shall have more to say below). This agreement not only with N¹ but also with N² and N³ means that Laur. 36.5 is a virtual diplomatic copy of the full condition of N as it existed in the 13th century. Both Slater and Heinsius might have suspected the relationship between the two mss., except that their collations were apparently incomplete.²¹ Heinsius cited secundus Mediceus in his edition seven times in Book 1, of which five were in association with N. Of the other two instances, *rerum* in 1.225 is a curiosity, for which the scribe offers the correct reading *veri* above; and what Heinsius read in 1.703 as *illa* is actually *illam*, the prevalent reading. Slater, using

²¹ I have not been able to study S. V. 8 personally, but have been warned by M. Reeve, who has labored over it, and by a photograph of one difficult page, that study can only be successful if one uses the original. Heinsius differentiated the mss. he collated by using different inks, and these cannot be distinguished from a microfilm or photograph. Heinsius had collated N in 1647; he worked on Laur. 36.5 in 1653, and it is easy to imagine how he might not have been able to check the earlier collation at the time he was in Florence.

Heinsius' collation, cited Mediceus quintus twelve times for Book 1, of which ten agreed with N. The exceptions are 1.206, where Heinsius apparently construed the gloss over *murmura* as an alternate reading and then reversed its order with the verb so as to produce a metrical phrase, *compressit fremitus*; the other is a simple error, *montes* 1.285, for which no known ms. offers support.²² In any case, it is no longer important to cite secundus Mediceus or Mediceus quintus, because the readings of Laur. 36.5 are derived from the excellent N which we still have.²³ However, collation of Laur. 36.5 can be the means, now that we know its parent, of correcting erroneous collation of N. For example, Slater reported correctly that Mediceus quintus had *vitalisque* in 2.828; it should be no surprise to discover that N, which elsewhere favors the *-is* form of the acc. pl. in the 3rd declension, exhibits the same reading. Other readings that I have recovered from N after collating Laur. 36.5 are: 1.132 neque 2.779 Nec 3.72 Tunc 7.362 mera 461 iungit et hinc 8.61 reseret 8.463 pugnat 504 primo 643 perducit 870 habiit 883 potui 9.529 correptis 713 fieret²⁴ 10.239 qua 613 petere. 622 nollet 673 dea muneris.

When Heinsius realized that Laur. 36.15 was a direct copy of M, he quite rightly collated nothing but Book 15, because M lacks Book 15, and so 36.15 offered independent evidence for that part only of the poem. We might follow the same methodology with Laur. 36.5, and assert that, being a partial copy of N, it has no independent authority until the second hand and second source takes over at 11.67. That would be proper procedure except for two things: 1) Laur. 36.5 might be contaminated with another useful tradition; 2) Laur. 36.5 might help us to recover readings in N which were erased or lost after this 13th century copy was made. I shall state immediately that I have not found contamination in Laur. 36.5. On the other hand, I wish to suggest that collation of this ms. *does* help us to recover readings of N which have been lost, I believe, after the scribe of our ms. made his copy from N, and others which were more legible then than now.

Let me give examples drawn from Book 1 of how Laur. 36.5 may profitably be employed to enhance our accuracy on N. In 1.667, Laur. 36.5 reads *inde*. No reader of N has apparently noticed, but it should be recorded

²² N has been erased and then corrected.

²³ I have found a good many errors in Heinsius' collation of Laur. 36.5. Anyone using it should assume that it gives in the text the reading it could decipher in N, that its superscripta follow N³. Where Heinsius reports something else, one should be suspicious.

²⁴ Now that N has been found to have in 9.529 and 713 the same readings as M and other mss., we must accept these as the readings of the archetype of both main traditions and presume, unless we have good evidence to the contrary, that Ovid wrote them.

that N has (*u ex i*)*nde*. In 1.623 Magnus reports that N has *furtis*; in fact, it has *furti*(*s*? in *ras*). The hand that wrote the erased *s* can not be ascertained nor can the chronology of the erasure. Laur. 36.5 reads *furti*, which it emphasizes by the same word in the margin. In 1.510. Laur. 36.5 has *quo*, and *qua* above; careful study of N indicates that it has *quo* which was changed to *qua*. Laur. 36.5 exhibits in 1.230 *Quod* (*Quos* *sscr.*). Although the leaf in N which contains 1.230 replaces the original Beneventan leaf, it might have been replaced before Laur. 36.5 was copied, because the replacement reads *Quo*(*s* in *ras.*; *fuit d*). Finally, in 1.190, Laur. 36.5 has *vulnus* (*corpus* *sscr.*). N has been erased, and a late hand has written in *vulnus*, copying, I believe, the marginal note that recommends *vulnus*.²⁵ It is just possible that *corpus* was originally in N, as it was, we know, in M, and that Laur. 36.5 derived its alternative reading from N.

Although not every example above is as cogent as those of 1.510 and 607, it is important to attempt to recover the original state of N as accurately as possible. Therefore, I have assembled below in two parallel lists the readings of Laur. 36.5 and N which I consider significantly related in this manner.

Laur. 36.5	N
2.101 dubites	dubit(a ² <i>ex</i> -es)
284 fumum (tantum <i>sscr.</i>) volitant	fumum volitant ³ //// in <i>ras.</i> (tantum <i>sscr.</i>)
288 Quid	Q(uod in <i>ras.</i>)
378 Tradit et	Tradit (ut ² in <i>ras.</i>)
771 pigra (-e <i>sscr.</i>)	pigr (-e <i>ex</i> -a?)
790 -que et nubibus	(-que <i>eras.</i>) et nubibus
819 illi (illa <i>sscr.</i>)	ill(a ² <i>ex</i> i)
3. 29 ac culmine (vimine <i>sscr.</i>)	a(c ²) (c- <i>eras.</i>)u(i <i>ex</i> l)mine
341 fide	fide ¹
557 absistite	a(s <i>ex</i> b)sistite
594 fluviale	(p in <i>ras.</i>)luviale
693 ut ira magis v. ab(con- <i>sscr.</i>)- sumere	(et in <i>ras.</i>) ira m(ora ² in <i>ras.</i> ?) (s <i>eras.</i>) v. a(b <i>ex</i> s, con- ³ <i>sscr.</i>)sumere
731 direpta	di(sc ⁴ in <i>ras.</i>)e(~ <i>sscr.</i>)pta
4. 61 quos (quod <i>sscr.</i>)	quo(d in <i>ras.</i>)
111 venires (-re <i>sscr.</i>)	venire (-res ³ <i>sscr.</i>)
136 premit	(fre ⁴)mit
323 mater (<i>nihil</i> <i>sscr.</i>)	mater (ff <i>sscr.</i>) ⁴ 26
426 flere (<i>nihil</i> <i>sscr.</i>)	flere (ferre ⁴ <i>sscr.</i>) ²⁶
435 illu(a <i>sscr.</i>)c	ill(u ² <i>ex</i> a)c
482 rubentem (madent- <i>sscr.</i>)	rub(mad- ³ <i>sscr.</i>)entem ²⁶

²⁵ I shall later show that the superscripts in Laur. 36.5 have copied N³.

²⁶ Slater attributes this loosely to N² and thus confuses the picture.

Laur. 36.5	N
4. 504 mixta (<i>nihil</i> <i>sscr.</i>)	mixta (tincta ⁴ <i>sscr.</i>) ²⁶
527 riget	rige(~ <i>add.</i> ³)t
567 <i>nihil</i> <i>sscr.</i>	erratibus <i>sscr.</i> ⁴
598 terrentur	terre(n <i>eras.</i>)tur
610 putat	put(e ² in <i>ras.</i>)t
623 aequare	ae(the ² <i>ex</i> quo)re
692 iustior (-ius <i>sscr.</i>)	iusti(us ³ in <i>ras.</i>) ²⁷
709/10 tortum (-o <i>sscr.</i>)/...	<i>idem</i>
plumbum (-o <i>sscr.</i>)	
710 medii	medi(o ²)
746 Con(per- <i>sscr.</i>)cepitque...	<i>idem</i> , <i>sscr.</i> ³
ri(vi- <i>sscr.</i>)gorem	
749 ut erant (quod erant <i>sscr.</i>)	ut erant ¹ (quod erant ³ <i>sscr.</i>) ²⁷
782 Sed (se <i>sscr.</i>)	Sed (se ³ <i>sscr.</i>)
790 Ante spectatum	Ante (ex ⁴) spectatum
796 neque (nec <i>sscr.</i>)	ne(c in <i>ras.</i>)
5. 15 servatae	servat(a in <i>ras.</i> ; e <i>fuit</i> ?) (<i>add.</i> m)
21 luctuque letabere	luctu/// le(t ² <i>ex</i> v)abere
113 canendo (-bas <i>sscr.</i>)	cane(bas ² <i>ex</i> ndo)
132 missum	missum (mersum ⁴ <i>sscr.</i>)
301 Hauxerunt	Hau(s <i>ex</i> x)erunt
334 vacat	vac(at ² in <i>ras.</i>) ²⁷
347 mollibus	mol(l <i>eras.</i>)ibus
478 parilique irata	pari(ter, <i>fuit</i> li)que (et- <i>fuit</i> ir)at (e <i>ex</i> a)
667 nobis	(v ⁴ <i>ex</i> n)obis
6. 114 Amne mosinen	Am(ne <i>eras.</i> ut <i>vid.</i>) mosynen
117 Amnis in aolida	Amnis in aolida(n <i>add.</i> ⁴)
212 recidat	(dec- <i>ex</i> recc-?) idat
338 suos (-o <i>sscr.</i>)... sinus	<i>idem</i> , <i>sscr.</i> ³
(-u <i>sscr.</i>)	
506 Utque fidei	Ut(que <i>eras.</i>) fide(i <i>add.</i> ³)
664 immersa(semesa <i>sscr.</i>)que	<i>idem</i> , <i>sscr.</i> ³
707 clamans (sonans vel adamans <i>sscr.</i>)	(cl- <i>add.</i> ³)am(a <i>ex</i> e)ns (vel adamans, sonans <i>sscr.</i>)
7. 89 Utque	Ut(que <i>eras.</i>)
213 rudem (-brum <i>sscr.</i>)	<i>idem</i> , <i>sscr.</i> ³
252 auras (aras <i>sscr.</i>)	a(u <i>eras.</i>)ras (aras <i>sscr.</i> ³)
264 receptas	rec(s <i>sscr.</i> ⁴)ep(c <i>sscr.</i> ⁴)tas
	(Plates 3 and 4)
341 Ulla	(I <i>ex</i> U ut <i>vid.</i>)lla (illa <i>sscr.</i> ³)
444 chirone	(s- <i>add.</i> ⁴)chirone
616 Isse sub amplexu sasopidos	Isse sub amplexu (sa- <i>eras.</i>)sopidos
642 Ponere et	Ponere (7 ² = et) ²⁷

²⁷ Here, I disagree with the report of Magnus.

Laur. 36.5		N
7. 765	Ruriculae	Ruri(colae in ras.) ²⁸
786	morsus (cursus sscr.)	mo(t ² ex rs)us (vel cursus vel morsus sscr.) ²⁷
813	ne-(ve- sscr.)nias	idem, sscr.
824	fa(i sscr.)cti	f(i ex a)cti
8. 19	bellum(o sscr.)	bellum(-o sscr.) ³
160	In se ponit	(In se ut vid, eras.) ponit
880	Corporibus	Corpori(s/o ³ in ras. ex -bus)
9. 119	parentem (-im sscr.)	par(a ⁴ ex e)ntem(-im sscr.) ³
145	Quae quoniam veniat	Quae quoniam (ad- eras.)veni(at in ras.) ³ ²⁷
151	iugulata	iugula(n sscr., d ex t)a
405	deflent atque	//flent atque (deflebunt sscr.)
413	petet	pet(e ² ex a)t ²⁷
537	causa	causa(-m add.) ⁴
553	Conueniensque V. e. annis	Conueniens/ V. e. rebus (annis in marg.) ¹
625	deo sed	d(eo set in ras.) ²
629	vota	vot(o ex a)
668	mutato	mutat(a ² ex o)
773	foronque	f(a ex o)ronque
791	eras . . . es	era(t in ras., fuit s) . . . es(t add.) ⁴
10. 47	oranti	oranti(s eras.)
55	affuerant	a(b in ras.)fuerant
113	gemina (demissa sscr.)	gem(m ex in ²)a(-ta add.) ² (demissa sscr.) ³
460	proprior	prop(i/ in ras.)or
473	inlato	(in ⁴ in ras.)lato
611	hunc formosis (iuvenem sscr.)	h. (iuvenem in ras.) ⁴ maledixit
	maledixit	
699	unguem (-es sscr.)	ungue(s ex m)
11. 48	obscuraque	obs(c ² ex tr)u(r ² ex s)aque

I have described above the leaves which have been inserted in N either to supply a defect inherited from O or to replace losses in N itself some time after it had been copied. The insertions in Books 8 and 13 were the work of the same Beneventan hand, and we should expect that, since they predate Laur. 36.5, they would be incorporated in it. This expectation is justified by the disorder of Laur. 36.5 after 8.339 and by the fact that its text of 8.340-402 agrees with the Beneventan insert. The comparable portion of Book 13 has not survived in Laur. 36.5 from the hand of the original scribe, so we cannot be sure how that portion would have been treated. However, I believe that the text of 8.398-402 and 597-602, which the later Beneventan hand supplied on f. 161^r in N after 13.138, but the

²⁸ A Beneventan hand, but not N², has written -colae in the erasure; I also believe that the o was changed from an original u at some point.

scribe of Laur. 36.5 copied in normal order, may well indicate use of that second insert of N.²⁹ A more interesting problem is the relation between the lost text of N at ff. 7 and 16, that of Laur. 36.5, and that of the late replacement in N.

Would it be possible to restore the text of N from either or both of these known versions, on the assumption that N still possessed the page when the scribe of Laur. 36.5 copied and also that the late replacement might have been a copy of the ruined leaf that kept falling out? Because we do possess M for both these sections of the *Met.*, we do have some control over the situation. Below, I give lists of readings for comparison.

Laur. 36.5	N ⁴	M
1. 198 notus	motus	notus
199 studiisque	-que sscr.	studiisque
202 attonitum	actonitum	attonitum
204 tuorum est	est om.	tuorum est
209 solvet (-it sscr.) ³⁰	solvit	solvit
210 admissum est	admissum	admissum
218 arcadas hinc ³⁰	archadas hinc	arcadis hic
222 certo (aperto sscr.)	certo	aperto
225 rerum (veri sscr.) ³⁰	veri	veri
230 quod	quo(s ex d)	quod
231 dignosque ³⁰	dignos	dignos
232 ipso	ipso	illo
235 vertitur	utitur	utitur
	(ur- aut utitur sscr.)	
241 erinis	herinis (in ras.)	erinis
249 piasne (feris sscr.)	ferisne	ferisne
255 longusque	longusque	longusque
	(totusque sscr.)	
2. 121 quadrupides	quadru- (Plate 1)	quadri-
122 tunc ³⁰	tum	tum
128 vola (e sscr.)ntes	volantes	volantes
132 effuge (-git sscr.) ³¹	effugit	effugit
136 egressus	ingressus	egressus
139 aram (Plate 2)	oram	aram
141 consulat	consulet	consulat

²⁹ There are two other possibilities: 1) Laur. 36.5 copied 8.398-402 from the 5 lines added to the Beneventan replacement after it was inserted. This can be rejected, because the writing of those 5 lines is later than that of Laur. 36.5. 2) Laur. 36.5 copied the text of a second ms. it was using. But we have no evidence that it in fact was using another ms., since, as we see below, its superscripta come from N³.

³⁰ I believe that reconstruction of N may also be helped by the readings of U, a somewhat more distant relative than M. U gives the following useful readings: 1.209 solvet 218 arcadas hinc 225 rer/ (= rerum?) 231 dignosque 2.122 tunc 143 Humida 152 ille 165 aera 167 ruuntque.

³¹ L also has *effuge*.

	Laur. 36.5	N ⁴	M
2.143	Humida tetigit	umida tangit (tetigit in marg.)	Humida tetigit
151	leves	datas (in ras.)	leves (datas sscr.)
152	ille ³⁰ (inde sscr.)	ille	inde ³²
154	Quartus equi philegon solis	Solis equi quartusque phlegon	Solis e. q. ph.
156	thetis	tethis	thetis
157	caeli	caeli	caeli
159	levati	levati(-s eras.)	levatis
160	isdem	hisdem	hisdem
165	insueto vacuos(-us sscr.)	(in ex as)sueto vacu(os man. al.)	as(in sscr.)sueto vacuos (-us sscr.)
	aera ³⁰	aere	aer(a ex e)
166	Discutiturque	Succutiturque	Succ.
167	ruuntque ³⁰	ruunt	ruunt
168	quadriuges	-iuges	-iugi
170	Ne(c sscr.)scit	Ne(c scit in ras.)	Nec scit
172	tingui	t(a ex i)ngi	ting(i ex ui)
176	bootes	boetes	bootes
179	patentes	iacentes	patentes
181	obortae	abortae	abortae ¹

It is evident that the crucial section 1.198–255 does not have so many problems as 2.121–181. However, the best that can be said for f. 7 in N is that it is a very clumsy copy. It is obviously wrong at 1.198 and 199; its spelling is irregular at 202; its elimination of *est* at 204 is not supported by any of the older mss. It disagrees with M and the correct text at 218 and 222, offers a wrong alternative at 255, and preserves the correct reading with most mss. against M at 232. In 218, 222, and 232, Laur. 36.5 also shares its readings; and indeed only with *certo* at 222 does N⁴ offer an infrequent reading. But whereas Laur. 36.5 had a more careful scribe, it is difficult to claim that its variants from M must be assigned to N. It is correct in 232, and we may assume that its reading was in N, O, and Ovid's first ms. It seems to be wrong with its additional *est* in 210; that could have been in N, but I suspect that the error is later. It is also wrong in its additional *-que* in 231, but that was an early attempt to deal with the universal error in the archetype created by *dominum*; it is shared by such close contemporaries as ELU, so may have been in N. Similarly, the reading *arcadas hinc* may have been in N¹. For the five instances where Laur. 36.5 offers variants, I assume that they are the work of N² or N³. I am satisfied that *certo* is a gloss that has entered Laur. 36.5 and N⁴ from

³² Magnus' report is incorrect here.

separate sources, but should not be allowed to oust the *lectio difficilior*. Similarly, *vertitur* at 235 is unlikely to have been in N: it arose in a period of non-Beneventan writing when a single line over *utitur* could make it *vertitur* and the careless expectation of the verb in situations of metamorphosis encouraged N³ to adopt the error.³³ Both *solvet* 209 and *rerum* 225, though rare errors, are found in N's close Beneventan contemporary U. As we shall see, an arguable link exists between N and U. I therefore tentatively suggest that these readings were found by the scribe of Laur. 36.5 in N, the work of either N¹ or N²; the scribe then wrote as superscripta the correct text which N³ had added above. I do not know what to do with unique *piasme* of 249. Accordingly, I do not think that the scribe of f. 7, that is, N⁴, had access to a poor leaf of N, which he was to copy and replace; the text of f. 7 offers special errors and nothing of significance. But I suggest that we may be able to postulate that the original leaf in N existed at the time when Laur. 36.5 was copied. On that assumption, by using M and U as controls, I partially reconstruct the 13th century text of N in 1.198–255 as follows: 198 notus 199 studiisque 204 tuorum est 209 solv(et in ras.²) (solvit³ sscr.) 210 admissum 218 arcadas hinc 222 aperto (certo sscr.³) 225 (r- in ras.²)er(um in ras.²) 230 quod 231 dignosque 232 ipso 235 utitur (vertitur sscr.³) 241 erinis 255 longusque.

The text of 2.121–181 produces more variants than 1.198–255, but here too the insert in N, by a different hand from that in insert 1, can be branded as late and negligible. It is wrong at 136, 139, 141, 143, 151 (an erroneous "correction"), 176, 179, and 181; and only *datas* in 151 and *abortae* in 181 have a claim as 11th century readings. As against Laur. 36.5 it preserves the correct reading alone in 156—probably a scholarly correction of a longstanding error in the archetype, the more familiar name Thetis for rarer Tethys—and agrees with M and other mss. at 122, 132, 154, 165, 166, and 167. However, N elsewhere gives *tunc* where *tum* is the accepted reading (cf. 3.72 and 504), and U also had *tunc*; therefore, I propose to regard Laur. 36.5's reading at 122 as a true reading of N¹. Although L also has *effuge* in 132, I prefer to believe that N¹ agreed with M and most mss. and that the error crept into Laur. 36.5 from N² or N³. At 154 the error is obvious, but possibly so obvious that it existed in N (cf. *Quartus equi phil. 67*): I feel no confidence in reconstructing N here. At 159, 165, and the spelling of 160, Laur. 36.5 could well point to the work of the correcting hand in N. The error in 166 is unique, possibly the text of N or a blunder of the scribe of Laur. 36.5. The error

³³ L and ε have *vertitur*; the change, therefore, could be pre-Beneventan in N's parent. For the reversal of N's text and *superscriptum* by the scribe of Laur. 36.5, note 4.435 and 7.259.

in 167 is shared with U, but is such an affront to meter and sense that I would not want to attribute it to N and hesitate even assigning it to N². On other readings, I assume that Laur. 36.5 faithfully preserves N at 143—aspersion is common in O (cf. 160)—, in the variant at 152, in 172, 176, 179, and, as elsewhere with this word, in *obortae* at 181.³⁴ Thus, I would use Laur. 36.5 to reconstruct N (controlling it somewhat with M and U) as follows: 2.122 tunc 128 volantes 132 effugit 136 egressus 139 aram 141 consulat 143 Humida tetigit 151 leves 152 inde 154 ??? 156 thetis 157 caeli 159 levati(-s eras.) 160 hisdem 165 (in- ex as-2) sueto vacuus (es sscr.) aer(a ex e) 166 ??? 167 ruunt 168 ??? 170 Nec scit 172 tingui 176 bootes 179 patentes 181 obortae.

Finally, I come to the *superscripta* in Laur. 36.5 and their relevance to N³. As I pointed out above, two consistent correcting hands worked over N, first a Beneventan which we may call N², then a century later an Italian which I propose to call N³. In fact, further tampering occurred in N, and I have vaguely named any scribe subsequent to N³, both the scribes of the replaced ff. 7 and 19 as well as later correctors of the text, as N⁴. I have pointed out that Slater vitiated his report of the correcting hands by refusing to follow the lead of Riese or Magnus and so failing to distinguish the 12th century, 13th or 14th century hands: in the list of useful readings supplied by Laur. 36.5 to throw light on the actual state of N at time of copying in the 13th century, my note 26 indicates some of the problems caused by Slater's vagueness. Indeed, now that we know that Laur. 36.5 is a direct copy of N, a comparison of alternative readings and glosses in both mss. can be very useful.

Plates 3 and 4 exhibit parallel readings for 7.242–265. N shows Beneventan corrections at 246 *liquidi* and 249 *coniuge*; Laur. 36.5 predictably agrees. Most non-Beneventan corrections in N may be assigned to N³ because Laur. 36.5 adopts them: 245 *Conicit* 247 *Altera* (sscr.) 252 *aras* (sscr.) 255 *iubet* (possibly N²) 257 *sparsis* 258 *flagrantes* 259 *atri* (Laur. 36.5 has reversed text and *superscriptum*) 262 *calido*. To N⁴ must be given the dubious credit of forcing superscript *aras* into the text: he erased the *u* of the correct reading *auras*, which Laur. 36.5 exhibits unmarred. And N⁴ corrected *receptas* (264), which the scribe of Laur. 36.5 had faithfully copied from N. Most glosses in N are the work of N³, non-Beneventan notes which 36.5 has accurately copied. Once, in the marginal comment at 263, Laur. 36.5 has corrected N³. In five lines, where the special writing might otherwise make us suspicious, Laur. 36.5 shows no note. These should be the work of a later scribe: the extra gloss in 244 over *cultrosque*,

³⁴ On the correct spelling of *obortae* in N, cf. 1.350, 2.656, 7.689, 10.67 and 419.

246 *bachi*, 255 the marginal note, 260 two *superscripta*, 262 the marginal gloss.

Plates 5 and 6 give the partially overlapping texts of 9.127 ff. in N and Laur. 36.5; Plates 7 and 8 do the same for 9.399 ff. Since N wrote 31 lines per page and Laur. 36.5 only 29, it is impossible to secure full corresponsion. The corresponding lines here are 9.147–155 and 9.417–429.³⁵ We may note first that the text of N has been corrected in 9.127 ff. three times by a non-Beneventan hand, and Laur. 36.5 exhibits the new text: 9.148 *ac ex an*; 9.151 *pe(l eras.)lice*; 9.150 *pos(c ex s)it*. But (151) where another hand has erroneously changed N to *iugula*(nd in *ras*)*a*, Laur. 36.5 retains what is correct and what it presumably found in N: *iugulata*. Both mss. show almost identical *superscripta*; the slight differences help us distinguish the hands. The two hands abbreviate in an occasionally distinct way, and this fact plus the distinguishable form of the taller letters (d, l, s) enables us to state that different scribes, as we might expect, produced the *superscripta* in the two mss. However, one exception is noticeable; in the right hand margin of both mss. at 9.151, the same hand, I believe, has produced the same gloss: “ostendo illum dolorem tantum.” The style of the d and l is sufficiently identifiable so that we can say that the hand responsible for the *superscripta* elsewhere in Laur. 36.5 has also worked on N here.

In 9.417–429, we can quickly see three places where the text of N has been altered. In 417 Laur. 36.5 preserves the original *praecipiet*; which dates the changed reading *percipiet* of N later. In 423, the different ink of the added *-que* suggests that it is the work of N³; Laur. 36.5 incorporates the addition with the original word. Thirdly, since Laur. 36.5 reads *turvida* with N³ in 427, the correction in N must be by N⁴. As for the *superscripta* and *marginalia*, we can readily distinguish three hands in N which have written notes above the line and of course another Beneventan hand that has produced the “Lactantian” *fabulae*, here occupying almost the entire right margin of N. A Beneventan hand has glossed *Pallantias* in 421; not surprisingly, that gloss has been taken over in Laur. 36.5 The same 13th century hand which worked over 9.147 ff. has also copiously annotated almost every line of 417 ff., and these notes appear verbatim in Laur. 36.5. But the glosses in N over *dixit* in 418, *Anchisae* in 425, and in the right margin at 424 were written later and hence could not be copied by the scribe of Laur. 36.5.

All the evidence can best be explained, I think by assuming that N³

³⁵ To help the reader, I note that 9.147 begins at the top of N, but about two-thirds of the way down in Laur. 36.5; that 9.417 begins at the top of Laur. 36.5, but about two-thirds of the way down in N, just above the large capital.

had worked over N, altering the text here and there, writing alternative readings and glosses, before Laur. 36.5 was copied from N. The scribe of Laur. 36.5 performed a very faithful job, regularly copying N exactly as he read it. However, here and there, he chose to invert the order of original and *superscripta*; and occasionally he corrected obvious places in N, such as *omnipudens* for *omnipotens*, when referring to Jupiter.³⁶ Thus, the presence of material copied from N³ in Laur. 36.5 gives us a terminal date for N³, and the absence of corrections and glosses which, because of differences in the writing, can be assigned to N⁴ means that N⁴ worked on N after the scribe of Laur. 36.5 did his job. Apart, then, from the sporadic evidence Laur. 36.5 gives us on the state of N in the 13th century where N has suffered subsequent corruption or loss of leaves, the main use of Laur. 36.5 is to help us fill in some of the stages of change experienced by N after the first Beneventan hand finished his task.

III. N AND U

Slater's most significant manuscript discovery was to locate *codex Urbinas* which Heinsius had studied in Urbino in the mid-17th century. Subsequently, the Library of the Dukes of Urbino was appropriated by the Pope and transferred to the Vatican. The special ms. of the *Met.* remained unused until Slater reported his discovery of Vat. Urb. lat. 341. The importance of U is threefold: it is the oldest ms. of the *Met.* to have been found in the 20th century; it is the only ms. beside N now surviving in Beneventan script; it shows important, unique agreement with N and the combined family of M and N that is called O.

Slater was able to use the scholarly data assembled by Loew in *Beneventan Script* to date U at the end of the 11th or possibly beginning of the 12th century, and he also linked it with other products of the Bari region. Consequently, U is perhaps a quarter century older than N. Since they were both copied in the same general area of Southern Italy and are separated by such a brief interval, we might be tempted to look for a definite relationship between N and U. For example, did N copy U? Or did N copy the parent of U? Or might N have been corrected from U; that is, can N² be derived from U? Let me say right now that the evidence does not permit a simple solution along the lines of any of these hopeful questions. In the Bari area at the end of the 11th century, there apparently existed at least *two* mss. of the *Met.*, from one of which N was copied, from the other U. The two parent mss. had some interesting correspon-

³⁶ N has this unique *omnipudens* at 1.154, 2.401 and 505.

dences, but U, while preserving modest traces of the O-tradition, is our fullest early example of the contaminated tradition that we find exemplified also in the Florentine mss. F and L and in E, the *primus Palatinus* that Slater re-discovered.³⁷

Slater made a brief presentation of data pointing to the connection between N and U.³⁸ He produced an extensive list of common errors in Books 1 and 2, then select instances in other books. Removing 1.384 and 447 (because the first involves N² and the second U²) and adding other agreements in error, we have the following examples in Books 1 and 2: 1.119 tunc 163 vidit summa 302 in altis 363 formare 397 nocebat 481 *om.* (also M) 484 suffuderat (also M) 492 densis 519 licet 558 habebit 575 in hoc 646 patriis dat et oscula 733 loqui 747 niligera (also M) 747 Hinc 2.69 pavere 101 Ne dubites 119 dei 201 summum . . . tergum 227 Tunc 238 sparsis 262 siccae quoque 318 lacera late 335/6 sinus prima mox ossa requirens . . . artus totum percensuit orbem U (N¹ has been erased and corrected by N³ in the final hemistichs) 398 trementis 465 decedere 529 in caelo³⁹ 566 nequiquam 640 fatidicos 727 balearia 790 adoperta et 827 versat. It should be remembered that the opportunity for agreement is reduced by the fact that N¹ lacks, as we noted, 1.198-255 and 2.121-181, and U¹ lacks 1.1-75 and 413-470, a total of roughly 250 lines in the two mss.⁴⁰

In the same two books, U disagrees with N¹ and generally follows the contaminated tradition in errors as follows: 1.165 cenae 190 vulnus⁴¹ 258 moles operosa 269 et 317 superatque 323 reverentior 363 possem 370 Et set 384 rupitque 390 Inde 445 posset 573 Influit 599 inducta latas³⁹ 617 abdicere 618 illud 637 Conatoque 647 et³⁹ 720 in tot lumina³⁹ 722 hos⁴¹ 739 de 764 sibi *om.* 2.44/5 et . . . feres 47 petit ille 62 habetur 66 Fit . . . trepidat 116 Tum pater 269 undis 295 violaverit 340 flatus 378 Credit³⁹ 392 ignipedum 393 rexerat 506 et celeri³⁹ 518 Est vero cur quis³⁹ 525 expulsa 583 fixerat 584 Plangere³⁹ 687 natus 710 Despiciebat 716 milvius⁴¹ 720 agilis 736 et tersis 747 viae est 757 Lemniacam⁴¹ 765 bello 855 posses 863 vix ha vix. The list is appreciably longer (48 as against 32) in this second instance. Thus, whereas U shows a greater affinity with N than does any independent ms. except M, it has even more affinity with the tradition of generally less reliable mss.

³⁷ I date U as slightly older than F and L, neither of which, in any case, is as complete as U. ³⁸ Slater pp. 26-27. See also Bruère (above, n. 6) p. 112.

³⁹ Here, it can be argued that the reading should be accepted.

⁴⁰ Using M and U above, I have tried to reconstruct N on 1.198-255 and 2.121-181, on the assumption that Laur. 36.5 did copy its text as it looked in the 13th century after the corrections of N² and N³. ⁴¹ So N² in *ras*.

There are a number of cases above where N¹ has been obliterated, and N² (the second Beneventan hand, it will be recalled) has produced the same reading as U and other mss. against M: in 1.190 and 722, 2.716 and 757. "Correction" in N by this second Beneventan hand is far more evident in Books 11-14. According to my count, N² has changed N¹, either by erasure and over-writing or by superscripts, frequently also by inserting a line absent from both M and N, and thus regularized N in the direction of the more contaminated (but frequently correct) tradition, as follows: in 41 lines of Book 11, 40 lines of Book 12, 59 lines of Book 13, and 90 lines of Book 14. In all the above cases, although N² gives the same reading as U, that reading is shared with other mss. except in a mere 18 lines. U alone of the major early mss. agrees with N² in the following readings: 11.234 edita bacis 377 ad arma 478 non eminus 518 ascendere 717 postquam maris appulit 784 Se dedit 12.158 multifidi 165 visum est 184 neque quae 319 obscenae 341 in monte 574 gentis 13.406 urbes 733 ora ferens 14.13 dignus amore 497 paranti 601 aequare 660 Suscipiens. Tempted by this agreement, I devised a working hypothesis which I fondly hoped to prove in the interest of economy and neatness, namely, that the two neighboring Bari-type mss. had been brought into contact in the later 12th century and corrections made by N² on the basis of what he found in U. Unfortunately, the neat hypothesis in ms. studies turns out more often to be wrong than right, and so it happens in this instance of N² and U. In Book 13 and 14 alone, the change in N² disagrees with the reading of U at least 24 times.

	U	N ²
13. 29	in causam MN ¹ U	in causa EFN ²
77	in MN ¹ U	ad EFN ² P
78	hostem MN ¹ U	hostes EFN ² P
93	pectore MN ¹ UP	corpore EN ²
99	rapta MU	capta EFN ²
158	illa MU	arma EFN ² P
232	Audeat E ¹ MU	Audet ut E ² N ² P
243	Si tamen E ¹ MN ¹ U	Sic tamen N ² Vat. Lat. 1593
382	possit N ¹ U	posset A ⁴²
780	Hunc N ¹ U	Huc A
902	seductaque A	seductos hN ² P ¹
905	vestris . . . silvis MU	membris . . . versis hN ² (in ras.) Vat. Lat. 1593
14. 8	vectus A	lapsus EN ² P
175	iam nunc A	iam non FN ²
305	illis E ¹ (N ¹) U	illum E ² FN ² P
369	densatur E ² P ² U	densetur E ¹ FN ¹ (P ¹) ⁴³

⁴² A is the conventional symbol devised by Slater to represent the agreement of most mss. ⁴³ desertum M(N¹)

	U	N ²
14.377	repellit EU	reliquit FN ² P ⁴⁴
457	ad urbem A	ad arces EN ²
579	doceant N ¹ U ¹	deceant A
615	demersus MN ¹ U ¹	dimersus EN ² P
706.705	U	705/7 A (in marg. N ² , om. MN ¹)
795	nunc EPU	nec (in ras.) ⁴⁵
798	praestricta P ¹ U	praestructa EN ² P ² Vat. Lat. 1593 ⁴⁶
821	pronaque	pronomque EFN ² P ⁴⁷

Especially significant among the above instances are those where N² has altered a reading on which N¹ and U have originally agreed, e.g., 13.29, 77, 78, and most notably 382, 780, and 14.579; further, where the tradition has split into three strands and O had one reading, but the other mss. divided, N² copying some other ms. than U, e.g., 14.369, 377, 795, and 798. Finally, we might note that in the 13 lines which a Beneventan hand has added to N after 14.838 the sole instance where U gives a reading of interest—846 *ubi*—the emender in N goes with the prevailing *ibi*. The conclusion seems inescapable against my hopeful hypothesis: N² did not work from U either to correct the extant portion of his ms. or to complete the final lines of Book 14.⁴⁸ There was, therefore, at least one (no doubt many) more ms. of the *Metamorphoses* available to readers of N in the later 12th century.⁴⁹

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions, it seems to me, can be restated or drawn from this study of N and its relatives and applied to fill the history of the ms. and to refine our methodology in reporting its readings:

- ⁴⁴ relinquit M(N¹)h ⁴⁵ non FM ⁴⁶ praerupta M

⁴⁷ pronusque MN¹

⁴⁸ I do not claim that the supplier of 14.839-851 is the same as N², but I believe that he can safely be distinguished from U.

⁴⁹ Slater p. 26 has a tantalizing sentence: "notat ad finem poematis (sc. in U) librarius 'tres *Metamorphoseon* codices', duo vero integros unum autem mutilum, inesse 'Bibliothecae'." Slater and H. M. Bannister, who supplied him with much of his firsthand information about U, both believed that this note might bear significantly on the origin and relationship of N and U. I can find no such note in U. And since the original scribe of U did not have his final comments preserved because of the loss of the final leaves (which were replaced much later), there is no reason to expect that any later colophon by U³ or U⁴ would give any significant information about relationships among N and U and N². In fact, I now suspect that Slater was misled by what someone was reporting about the Library of Urbino. There are 3 *Metamorphoses* in the Vat. Urb. collection: 341 (which is U); 342 (a small fragment somewhat earlier than U, not in Beneventan); and 347 of the 15th century.

1. N was written in the Bari-type Beneventan script in the early 12th century (possibly 25 years earlier).
2. N's original scribe stopped at the bottom of f. 188v. at 14.838. Another Beneventan scribe, who was not far removed in time from N¹, completed Book 14 on 189r. It is not certain what was the condition of N's parent at the end of 14. Therefore, the analogy with M, which breaks off at 14.830 at the bottom of the *recto* of its leaf, may be invalid and must be used cautiously to postulate the condition of O.
3. Still another Beneventan scribe replaced two leaves which had been lost from O before the parents of M and N were copied. These losses were not observed by N¹, and therefore the insertions of 8.340-420 and 13.276-343 are noticeably out of place and disagree with the lineage of N¹.
4. Still another Beneventan scribe (= N²) went over the text and proceeded to correct it from another ms. that belonged to the more contaminated tradition, from which he supplied missing lines, wrote over some words, erased and re-wrote other words, and more frequently in the later books used *superscripta*. In the latter case, N¹ and N² can easily be read and reported; in the others, it is difficult, if not impossible to recover N¹.
5. We know that *Vat. Urb. lat.* 341 (= U) was also produced in the Bari-type Beneventan, shortly before N. It exhibits unique agreements with N which indicate a close relationship between *one* of its ancestors and N's. However, its primary affiliation is with the more contaminated tradition represented for us by EFL. Thus, N did not copy U.
6. It can further be shown that N² did not work from U. Hence, we can infer that the separate origins of N and U and N² point to the existence of three or more different mss. of the *Metamorphoses* in the region where they were produced in the late 11th and 12th centuries.
7. In the 13th century, another corrector (= N³) worked over N once more, mostly in the form of *superscripta*, which were written in a clear Italian hand.
8. Shortly afterwards, a copy of N was made. By that time, N may already have moved to Naples, but we cannot definitely establish its whereabouts until the 16th century. The copy, which has survived but is now defective, breaks off after 11.66 at the end of 138v, and hence it lacks a colophon which might have indicated where, when, and by whom it was copied and for whom. That copy eventually made its way to Florence, and Heinsius found and collated it in

- 1653 (without recognizing it as a direct copy of N) during his work at the Laurentian Library. He originally called it *Mediceus sextus*, miscalled it *Mediceus quintus* in *Bodl. Auct. S. V.* 8 (the index for that collation), then as the result of his evaluation of its age and merit named it *secundus Mediceus* in his edition of Ovid. It is now Laur. Med. 36.5.
9. Laur. Med. 36.5, a careful copy of both N¹ (or the overwritten erasures that are the work of N²) and the superscript readings of N³, enables us to distinguish any correcting or damage (= N⁴) suffered by N after this copy was made. It also encourages us here and there to check certain readings where N¹ has never been correctly noted or where N¹ or N² is difficult to decipher.
 10. Erasures or crude overwriting by N⁴ can be controlled and remedied by the text of Laur. 36.5.
 11. The two original leaves, ff. 7 and 19, now replaced in N by a 14th century hand, were in all likelihood still intact in N at the time when Laur. 36.5 was copied. Its text for 1.198-255 and 2.121-181, controlled by M and U, can be used to recover to some extent the hypothetical text of N¹, N², and N³.
 12. From the 16th century at latest, N has been and remained in Naples. It passed from private hands into the Library of S. Giovanni a Carbonara, probably at its founding in 1551. There, Heinsius collated it in 1647. In the 18th century, after the library of S. Giovanni was broken up, N was acquired by the Bourbons. As part of the Royal Library, which now is the National Library, N lay unused, unrecognized until Alexander Riese rediscovered it during the 1880's.

University of California, Berkeley

Did Tacitus Finish the *Annales*?

REVILO P. OLIVER

Since Tacitus completed and made public his *Historiae* before he finished, and presumably before he began, the *Ab excessu divi Augusti*, the two works must have circulated separately.¹ At some time in antiquity, however, probably when they were transferred from rolls to codices and perhaps in 275, when the Emperor Tacitus undertook to preserve and disseminate the work of the great historian whom he claimed as an ancestor,² the two

¹ In *Ann.* XI.11.1 he refers to the later books of the *Historiae* ("quibus res imperatoris Domitiani composui") as presumably well known to his readers. Tertullian in or after 197 referred to *Hist.* V by book-number (*Apol.* 16.2).—I need not remark that everyone who now studies the works of Tacitus will owe more to Ronald Syme's *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958) and Erich Koestermann's commentary on the *Annales* (Heidelberg, 1963–1968) than he can acknowledge in footnotes. For the rest, I limit myself to citing modern studies that seem to me fundamental and directly relevant to my inquiry, and I intend my references to include what they in turn cite; to mention and debate everything that touches, directly or indirectly, on my subject would be to convert this article into a long book, for which I see no need.

² Vopiscus, *Tac.* 10.3, which Syme (p. 687), with reference to an earlier article of mine, rejects as "a fable." One does not lightly disagree with Syme, but I remain unrepentant. The *Scriptores Historiae Augustae* are patently the work of a vulgar mind or minds, and no one would claim for the author or authors a concern for veracity greater than that of a modern journalist or "publicist," but, as Syme has repeatedly said, they are our only source for much of the period they cover, and our task is to determine, on the basis of our pitifully scanty information from other sources and inherent plausibility, what statements are probably historical. Since no one, so far as I know, has yet gone so far as to deny the existence of an emperor named Claudius Tacitus, and since it is highly unlikely that the greatest of the Roman historians had been utterly forgotten in the Third Century, nothing is more likely than that the emperor, whether or not he was a "military man," would have had the wit to profit from the coincidence of cognomina and bestow on himself the lustre of a probably supposititious (though not impossible) descent from the historian, thus acquiring a dignity and prestige that might increase his slight chance of dying a natural death. There could have been no better way of advertising the protective eminence he thus acquired than by promulgating official commands for the dissemination of the works of his adopted ancestor. The story is therefore inherently plausible.