The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Some Codices Vossiani and the Metamorphosis of Ovid

D. A. Slater

The Classical Review / Volume 29 / Issue 06 / September 2015, pp 174 - 178

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00048812, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00048812

How to cite this article:

D. A. Slater (2015). Some Codices Vossiani and the Metamorphosis of Ovid. The Classical Review, 29, pp 174-178 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00048812

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

The verb *mordere* is not even suitable. Goats, it is true, damage vegetation by nibbling it; but the devastation spread by M. Grunnius Corocotta, soliuertiator, when he and his snout get into the garden, consists much rather in routing up and in breaking down, and is much better described by *mersit*, which means *obruit*, *afflixit*, *perdidit*, *pessum dedit*. This use begins with cases where the metaphor is still clearly discernible and the disaster in which a thing is whelmed is expressed by the presence of an ablative: Verg. *Aen.* vi 429, xi 28 '*funere mersit acerbo*,' vi 512 '*me fata mea et scelus exitiale Lacaenae | his mersere malis*' (compare Liu. iii 16 4 '*superantibus aliis ac mergentibus malis*'), Liu. vi 17 2 '*mersam et obrutam fenore partem ciuitatis*,' Plin. *n.h.* vii 132 '*quam multos accepta adflixere imperia! quam multos bona perdidere et ultimis mersere suppliciis!*' Flor. i 47 (iii 12) 8 '*illae opes atque diuitiae adflixere saeculi mores, mersamque uitis suis quasi sentina rem publicam pessum dedere.*' Then this ablative disappears and *mergere* by itself means *ruin*, *crush*; and if an ablative is present it expresses that *by which*, not *in which*, the thing is whelmed: Liu. ix 18 1 '*Alexandro nondum merso secundis rebus*,' Ouid. *trist.* iii 11 38 '*carnifici fortuna potest mea flenda uideri, | te tamen est uno iudice mersa parum*,' Vell. ii 91 3 '*cum esset omni flagitiorum scelerumque conscientia mersus, nec melior illi res familiaris quam mens foret*,' Sen. *ep.* 55 3 '*quotiens aliquos amicitiae Asinii Galli, quotiens Seiani odium, deinde amor merserat*,' Luc. i 159 '*publica belli | semina, quae populos semper mersere potentes*,' vi 8 '*placet alea fati | alterutrum mersura caput*,' vii 655 '*trahere*

omnia secum | mersa iuuat gentesque suae miscere ruinae,' viii 509 '*regesque timet, quorum omnia mersit*,' anth. Lat. Ries. 472 1 '*non satis est quod nos mergit furiosa iuuentus | transuersosque rapit fama sepulta probris*,' Sil. viii 287 '*cernebat Paulus . . . labi, mergente sinistro | consule, res pessumque dari*,' Iuu. x 57 '*quosdam praecipitat subiecta potentia magnae | inuidiae, mergit longa atque insignis honorum | pagina*' (compare Cic. *pro Sull.* 87 '*rei publicae praecipitanti subueni, patriam demersam extuli*'), xiii 8 '*ut mediocris | iacturae te mergat onus*,' Plin. *n.h.* ix 67 '*nullusque prope iam mortalis aestimatur pluris quam qui peritissime census domini mergit*,' Verg. *Aen.* vi 615 '*ne quaere doceri . . . quae forma uiros fortunaue mersit*' is not easily intelligible but appears to contain another example. So *mersare* in Lucr. v 1008 '*tum penuria deinde cibi languentia leto | membra dedit, contra nunc rerum copia mersat*'; so *demergere* in Hor. *carm.* iii 16 13 '*concidit auguris | Argiui domus ob lucrum | demersa exitio*,' Sen. *Med.* 528 '*his adice Colchos, adice et Aeeten ducem, | Scythas Pelasgis iunge: demersos dabo*'; and so βαπτίζω and καταποντίζω in Greek, Lobeck *Soph. Ai.* pp. 357 sq.

It will be noticed that in these examples the metaphor signifies ruin of fortune or health or character: Priap. 65 1 is singular, so far as I know, in extending it to material destruction, such as laying a row of lilies flat. The French *abîmer* has acquired and often enjoys this meaning, as in Hugo *Les Misérables* v 13 '*j'ai eu tort d'abîmer le chapeau de ce monsieur.*'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

SOME CODICES VOSSIANI AND THE METAMORPHOSIS OF OVID.

In a Berlin Programm¹ on the text of Book xv., the testimony of Nicolaus Heinsius, that at xv. 804 '*Aeneaden*' is the reading of a '*Codex Vossianus*' of the poem, was dismissed as '*falsch*'

by Dr. Hugo Magnus, who arrived somewhat hastily at this conclusion on ascertaining from Dr. de Vries that the three MSS. of the *Metamorphosis*, from the library of Vossius, now at Leyden,² read

¹ *Studien zur Überlieferung und Kritik der Metamorphosen Ovids* (Berlin, 1893).

² These three Vossiani are quite distinct from the three MSS. of the *Metamorphosis*—

'illa deum,' 'etheri . . .,' and 'etherea' respectively. Happily, however, the Bodleian possesses the very volume in which Heinsius entered, in his own handwriting, not only a collation but also a description of the Vossianus in question, evidence which both establishes the truth of his statement and enables us to identify beyond a doubt this 'Codex Vossianus' with a MS. now in the British Museum, viz. Harleianus 2732. The Bodleian *Ovid*, which we may call X, is an Aldine of 1533, and in the catalogue is described, provisionally, as 'No. 640 of Poetae in 8vo and Bibliotheca Heinsiana.' X contains collations by N. H. of many MSS., four of them Vossiani, viz. G, H, I, f.

From information which Dr. de Vries has very kindly sent me it would seem that G and I are both at Leyden in the Bibliotheek der Rijks-Universiteit, numbered Quarto 25 ('olim A. Turnebi') and Oct. 51 respectively. G is the MS. from which Heinsius adopted tingitur at iv. 21, and it appears to offer placentior (εὐφροστέρα, Plan. cf. i. 527) at v. 603. De Vries regards it as 'of little value.' The description in X runs thus: 'Codex Vossianus D annorum qui Turnebi fuit. primus liber manu recentiori scriptus fuit.' I is somewhat featureless (see the collation of Book xv. made by De Vries for Magnus, *op. cit.*); but it is not quite clear that I and Oct. 51 are one and the same MS., for De Vries speaks of all three Leyden Vossiani as 'complete,' whereas I, teste Heinsio, lacked the first book and part of the second.¹ "I = codex Vossianus eiusdem aetatis. incipit, lib. ii. fab. Calistus' (*sic*). Of the third Leyden MS. ('Quarto 61')—the MS. which has 'illa deum' at xv. 804 (see C. R. xxvii. 257 f.)—there is no collation in X. Either N. H. col-

lated the MS. into another volume or he had the reading from some other source, perhaps from Vossius himself, who duly noted it, with a few excerpts, in the margin of his *Ovid* which is now in the Bodleian. These three Leyden Vossiani are all assigned by De Vries to the thirteenth century. Heinsius, it may be noted, tended to overestimate the age of his MSS.; f is described thus: 'Fragmentum eiusdem' (sc. Vossii) 'pari aetate, quod incipit lib. i. fab. Ius et desinit initio lib. viii.' The fragment, which is not known at Leyden, deserves honourable mention as the only MS. which has (or had) vi. 200 in its right place, the place to which it was restored *e coniectura* by Gronovius. A selection from f's readings may be added here.

Book ii. 19 at clivo. 62 non regit hos. 87 repugnat herinis. 200 sensere. 412 comam cui. 422 ut fessam vidit ('lege ut fessam videt' N. H.). 437 quive Iovem. 471 hoc unum restabat. 518 Est aliquid cur quis Iunonem (*unde* 'Estre aliquid' etc. N. H.). 743 Pleionaeque genus ego sum. Book iii. 31 aquis ibi conditus. 187 abstinit (*ut coniecit* Ellis). 202 vox ulla fuit. 291 est *omisit*. 396 attenuant. 641 furor egit Opheltes (Opheltes *ex silentio*). 665 dstringunt. Book iv. 150 dabit hoc in vulnere vires. 715 lucentia. Book v. 49 formam. 70 abigitque ('fortasse abditque' N. H.). 266 floribus undas. 267 studiisque. 365 digna deae certe. 349 tentatque. 555 mixtae. 619 Dictynna. Book vi. 199 von tamen, etc., 'post hunc versum f legit illum hoc modo "Latoniae turba quae quantum distat ab orba" optime nisi quod quo legendum' N. H. 203 tacita venerantur numina mente (*ex Vergilio Aen. i. 502?*). Book vii. 115 nec ignes (*ut videtur*). 116 anhelatus. 155 in ingentes oculos. 234 et iam nona dies. 498 ramumque forens. 616 isse sub ampl. Aeg. Asop. ignem. 636 et promittere idem. 680 telum iactabile. 777 excussae.

This brings us to H, a MS. of marked individuality, 'H = Codex Vossianus eiusdem aetatis. usque ad fabulam Leucothoes libro iv. mutilus erat nonnullis tamen manu adscriptis recentiori. adscriptis denuo. est hiatus lib. vi.

viz., 'BPL. 95-96' (saec. xiii) and 'BPL.'s 97' (saec. xiv)—in the general collection of the Leyden University Library (=the 'tres Leidenses' cited from time to time by Heinsius and Burmann), for description of which see Codices MSS. Lugduni Batavorum (E. J. Brill, 1912).

¹ 'Further, I had at vii. 155 "sibi" for "ubi" ("ut coniecit" Merkel), a reading which, De Vries reports, is not to be found in either of the Leyden Vossiani.'

initio fab. Progenes usque lib. viii. oratione Althaeae.¹

This is the Vossianus from which N. H. records 'Aeneaden conatur' at xv. 804.

Turning to Harleianus 2742 (saec. xiii.), you notice at once that the first six folia are in a much later hand than the rest, and on examination find that they contain only portions of the earlier books; *i.e.* 'usque ad fabulan Leucothoes libro iv. mutilus est.' The original hand begins on the recto of fol. 7 at iv. 207. Passing on, you find at fols. 13 and 14 great holes in the vellum which have destroyed two inches by two inches of the text, and after fol. 20 a gap: for 20v ends with vi. 416—*i.e.* 'initio fab. Progenes'—and 21r opens with viii. 507—*i.e.* 'oratione Althaeae.' 'Two quaternions are lost. 'There are many "glosses" in the margins, and on fol. 1r the name of a former owner, "Alexander Betavius, senator Parisiensis," with the date 1645.' Wanley had the volume rebound.

The quality of the MS. may be gauged by the excerpts from its text of Book xv. published by Professor Housman in the *Journal of Philology*, xxii. 154ff., and used, with somewhat contradictory acknowledgments, by Magnus in his recent edition of the poem (see pp. xxiii and 3). The agreement between the text of H and the text of e (Mr. Housman's symbol for Harl. 2742)—viewed in connexion with the evidence of the lacunae—is too complete to admit any doubt as to their identity. Unfortunately the MS. does not appear to be of exceptional value.² But, like so many of the 'deteriores,' it has its good things, *e.g.* 'momenta (*suprascript* ni)' at xi. 285. In the same book 'Instabilesque arcus' (line 177) may demand consideration—unless 'arcus' has arisen from 'aurcs,' *i.e.* 'aures.' At v. 590, for

the meaningless '(g)natas' of the Vulgate it has the '*varia lectio* gratas (*ut coniecit* Hellmuth),' adopting which we might do well to transpose lines 590 and 591 and to read the passage thus: 'Invenio sine vertice aquas, sine murmure euntes | . . . quas tu vix ire putares | sponte sua; gratas ripis declivibus umbras | cana salicta dabant nvtritaque populus unda.' In any case 'gratas' is right beyond a peradventure. And the confusion between 'gnatas' and 'gratas' here helps us to emend with something like certainty at xiii. 602, 'veluti cum flumina gratas | exhalant nebulas, nec sol admittitur infra.' 'Gratas,' a mere *epitheton ornans*, became first '*per errorem* gnatas' and then '*metri gratia* natas.' The archaic form 'gnatus' is frequent in the MSS. of the poem.

But the chief interest of the MS. lies in its reading 'Aeneaden,' at xv. 804, which, so far as we know, is unique; 'Aeneadem (*i.e.* en eadem!)' is a very different matter. On this line there is so much divergence in the MSS. that we can hardly hope to recover the truth. Since discussing the passage before in this *Review* I have seen a remarkable variant in a MS. in the Laurentian Library at Florence, Codex Strozianus 120 (the *alter Strozza* of Heinsius),³ written, so Signor Rostagno considers, in Upper Italy towards the end of saec. xii.—'Tum citharea suum palma percussit utraque | pectus et etherea—nube." Haec in textu; in margine "at pectus et hanc nube molitur condere cede<m>." As to 'palma,' ἐπέχω—noting, however, with Mr. Garrod that the best MSS. almost without exception have 'suum'—not 'manu': 'manu in F' is from the second hand: but the variants 'sed tandem (h), aeth<erea se in rasura man. altera> de<m> sic F, <a>eneadem *codd. non-nul.*' look very like corruptions of a text containing either 'eadem' or 'eandem,' which in the Strozian variant has first changed places with 'nube' and then been assimilated to 'caedem' in 802.

¹ To M. Craster, of the Bodleian Library, I owe some assistance in deciphering this description and the suggestion that the second 'adscriptis' is a dittography. N. H. hesitated between two phrases ('manu adscr. rec.' and 'adscr. denuo'), and failing to decide which fitted fitted the facts more aptly left them both standing.

² Magnus follows it against the rest at xv. 570 as well as at 804.

³ See footnote. The *prior Strozza* (saec. xii. *ineuntis*) of Heinsius is also in the Laurentian Library. Among other notable readings it has 'delo creteque' at xv. 541 and 'accenseor' at xv. 546.

This use of 'idem' is Ovidian (cf. iv. 593 and v. 205), and the indications point to 'hunc eadem molitur condere nube' or 'en eandem—nubem' as possibilities worth weighing."¹

But to resume: e came into Lord Harley's collection on October 22, 1725,² i.e. it was one of the large number of MSS. purchased for him on that day by Wanley from John James Zamboni, and should therefore be added to the list contained in Professor A. C. Clark's account of the transaction in the *Classical Review* for October, 1891, vol. v. p. 365 ff.³ But—'que diable venait-il faire dans cette galère?' The simplest explanation is that Voss had lent the MS. to Graevius, and that on his death in 1689 it remained in the Bibliotheca Graeviana. In earlier days, when Heinsius was editing the *Metamorphosis*, Graevius owned apparently only one MS. of the poem.⁴

In his sale catalogue⁵ he is credited with two, viz. 'No. 28, Ovidii Metamorphosis in pergamento' (= S the Codex Graevii proper); and 'No. 22, Ovid. Met. cum glossis in pergamento' (= the borrowed Vossianus, now Harleianus 2742). He had also a Fragment (No. 54, *Fragmenta Ciceronis de officiis* . . . Ovidii *Metamorph.* et Euclidis *Geometrica*'), and in Harleianus 2610 the British Museum possesses a very notable Fragment (= i.-iii. 1-622. saec. X. exeuntis),⁶ which came into Lord Harley's

collection on that same 20th October, 1725, and which Professor Clark therefore traces to the Library of Graevius. If he is right, the fragment clearly formed part of this volume (viz. G 54), which we must assume to have been broken up by Wanley, who then had the Ovid rebound with two other classical fragments and the Euclid's *Geometrica* incorporated with some *Arithmetica* to form what is now Harleianus 3595.⁷ The 'fragmentum Ciceronis de officiis' is not accounted for as yet.)

But the question cannot be considered as finally settled. Voss, according to the hand-written catalogue of his MSS. (B. M., Egerton MS. 2260, fol. 150 vo.), had an 'Ovidii Metamorphosis vetustiss.', which has disappeared. Harl. 2610 is the oldest known MS. of any considerable portion of the poem.⁸

The Graevius catalogue does not mention the age of No. 54, and the Voss catalogue does not speak of the 'vetustiss.' as a fragment. But readers of Wanley's *Diary and Note-book*⁹ will remark that he had his eye on Voss's MSS., or some of them, as 'things proper for the Library in the hands of particular persons.'¹⁰

The problem is further complicated by the fact that the *fragmentum Vossianum* mentioned above has also disappeared—had disappeared, apparently, before Voss's death, since it is not mentioned in his catalogue. And Harleianus 2610 was unknown to Heinsius, who yet was in touch with both Graevius and Vossius, to the former of whom he owed knowledge of (and permission to

¹ For 'eadem' as a disyllable there is the authority of Virgil, but 'eandem' I do not remember to have met elsewhere except in Accius (apud Nonium s.v. 'vesci') . . . accumbat mensam aut eandem oescatur dapem.' Yet another possibility is 'oectus et hunc molitur eadem condere sube,' 'eade' having fallen out before 'cōdere.'

² The date is entered on the first page in Wanley's hand, '20 die Octobris, 1725' (sic).

³ The Library of J. G. Graevius.

⁴ This he lent to Heinsius, who named it S ('S = Codex Joh. Georgii Graevii, 400 annorum'), and has left us its readings registered under the siglum in X. It is the MS. from which he restored 'vi' for 'ut' at vi. 690/691 and 'ululatus' at vii. 190.

⁵ British Museum, Department of Printed Books, 126a 16.

⁶ 'Cod. Harleianus 2610 . . . scriptus est, ut opinatur E. M. Thompson, cui submissa est cura codicum qui in Museo Britannico seruante, exeunte fere saeculo X., in Germania' (R. Ellis, *Anecd. Oxon.*, class. ser., vol. i., part v., p. v).

NO. CCLII. VOL. XXIX.

See also *Journal of Philology*, xii. 65 ff. The discovery and discussion of this MS. was Ellis' chief contribution to the study of the *Metamorphosis*.

⁷ Harl. 3595. Boethi Artis Arithmeticae libr. ii.—de Musica [Graevianus] 8]—*Geometriae Euclidis libr. ii.* sic '[G. 54]' (Clark, *op. cit.*, p. 371).

⁸ a is certainly, λ and π possibly, ninth century; but they are mere fragments, and in other respects are out of the question.

⁹ Lansdowne MS. 677.

¹⁰ The entry under date May, 1722, has not escaped me, but it is too vague to be regarded as closing this avenue of enquiry. Harleianus 2610 is a Quarto, and Wanley had not then seen the MSS., but only a list of them, from which 'they seem to be,' etc.

collate) the two Erfurdt MSS. This he states in so many words in X.

The upshot of this inquiry is that we need more light on the *codices Vossiani* of the poem. What has become of the *fragmentum Vossianum*?¹

¹ I note for what it is worth the fact that Graevius, according to his catalogue, possessed in MS. the 'Observationes Gronovii in Metamorphosin Ovidii' (G. 92). Now the restoration of vi. 200 to its proper place in the text was one of Gronovius' most brilliant contributions to the criticism of the poem. If Graevius was interested in this particular problem, he may well have borrowed from Voss the fragment Vossianum (which alone among known

Why are there four MSS. of the *Metamorphosis* in the catalogue of V.'s Library and only three now at Leyden, which yet bought the collection entire? Last—this is the point of supreme interest—if Vossius really possessed, as the evidence would indicate, an 'Ovidii Metamorphosis vetustiss.', can the manuscript be traced? Was it or was it not Harleianus 2610?

D. A. SLATER.

MSS. supports the conjecture) in order to satisfy a very natural curiosity as to the general character of the codex which confirmed his friend the critic. But this is a long shot.

REVIEWS

CLIO ENTHRONED.

Clio Enthroned: a Study of Prose Form in Thucydides. By WALTER R. M. LAMB. Large 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. xv + 319. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1914. 10s. net.

THIS is a good book, and important. Most critics praise the intellect of Thucydides, but content themselves with mild and puzzled disapproval of his style. Realising the probability that style reflects intellect, Mr. Lamb asks us to withhold our disapproval until we have tried to understand. He has analysed the stylistic methods, not only of Thucydides, but also of his contemporaries, and, so far as is possible, of his predecessors. The result throws light upon the history of Greek prose, reveals in Thucydides 'the ambition of producing not merely a truthful document but a vigorous and impressive witness of the truth,' and points a way towards a reasonable solution of the hitherto rather barren controversy as to the alleged interpolation of the text. Finally, the revelation of method and purpose in the style makes it easier to understand the intellectual greatness of the history.

At the outset Mr. Lamb thought it necessary to refute the plausibilities of Mythistoria. It may be doubted whether

Mr. Cornford himself still finds Thucydides ignorant of politics and blind to economics, misled by superstition, capable of sacrificing, deliberately or unconsciously, the truth of event to the exigencies of drama. If so, he will find food for reflection here. But I hope the refutation is unnecessary. I should willingly sacrifice this wholesome and entertaining demonstration that Thucydides is not what he is not, for a more complete discussion of his mind and purpose as they really are. Had Mr. Lamb substituted for his just exposure of Mythistoria a chapter on the arrangement of the subject-matter of the history, he would, I think, have been wise. By insisting upon the imaginative value of the so-called digressions concerning Pausanias and Themistocles (p. 17), and upon the fine political psychology which makes relevant the episode of Harmodios and Aristogeiton (p. 78), Mr. Lamb suggests a method by which he might have laid a broader foundation for his later argument. In the arrangement of his material, as in style, Thucydides used art, not always perfect, but always intelligent and deliberate; and the art is the servant of intellect, displaying, not distorting or concealing, truth. Consider, for example, Book III., broken up,