

P. Ovidius Naso,
The Heroides

P. Ovidius Naso, *The Heroides*:

Text and Translation

Edited and translated by

J. B. Hall

In collaboration with

†A. L. Ritchie and M. J. Edwards

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



P. Ovidius Naso, *The Heroides*: Text and Translation

Edited and translated by J. B. Hall in collaboration with †A. L. Ritchie
and M. J. Edwards

This book first published 2023

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2023 by J. B. Hall, †A. L. Ritchie and M. J. Edwards

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without
the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-2997-5

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-2997-7

CONTENTS OF VOLUME I

Introduction	vii
Catalogue of manuscripts	xix
Select bibliography	xliii
Text and translation	
Epistle 1: Penelope to Ulysses	2
Epistle 2: Phyllis to Demophoon	10
Epistle 3: Briseis to Achilles	20
Epistle 4: Phaedra to Hippolytus	30
Epistle 5: Oenone to Paris	40
Epistle 6: Hypsipyle to Jason	50
Epistle 7: Dido to Aeneas	60
Epistle 8: Hermione to Orestes	72
Epistle 9: Deianira to Hercules	80
Epistle 10: Ariadne to Theseus	92
Epistle 11: Canace to Macareus	104
Epistle 12: Medea to Jason	112
Epistle 13: Laodamia to Protesilaus	126
Epistle 14: Hypermetra to Lynceus	138
Epistle 15: Sappho to Phaon	148
Epistle 16: Paris to Helen	162
Epistle 17: Helen to Paris	184
Epistle 18: Leander to Hero	200
Epistle 19: Hero to Leander	214
Epistle 20: Acontius to Cydippe	228
Epistle 21: Cydippe to Acontius	242

Introduction¹

JBH first began to take a serious interest in the text of the *Heroides* when as a research student working on Claudian under the supervision of the late Professor E. J. Kenney (1924-2019) he was shown an early draft of EJK's review of Heinrich Doerrie's *Untersuchungen*. Kenney's edition of the amatory works then with OUP was, he understood, going to be followed in due course by an edition of the *Heroides*, but he did not have the luck to hear Kenney's lectures on the *Heroides*. He does, however, thanks to the kindness of his friend Professor S. J. Heyworth, have xeroxes of the materials which EJK distributed to his lecture classes, from which some inferences can be drawn about his preferences in the matter of readings and conjectures at the time of the lecture courses.

As long as JBH remained in expectation of an OCT of the *Heroides* from EJK, he did not embark on large-scale work on the collection, although he did have the opportunity of examining at first hand a number of manuscripts including the Puteaneus (P); and all the while found himself drawn more and more to ponder the remarks of L. P. Wilkinson, in whose view most of the letters were too long.²

'What words would X have written?' was the starting-point for the ancient theorists of verbal impersonation (*prosopopoeia*); and it is a good one for us to bear in mind as we scrutinise the letters. But the question 'What would X have written?' brings with it the opposing question 'What would X not have written?' and the related questions 'What would X not have chosen to write?' and 'What would X have been unwise to write?' We may allow the writer some licence to stray – many writers are discursive and do not stick strictly to the point – but would the heroine deliberately have forgotten to whom she was writing and said things better not said to her recipient, or blatantly have contradicted herself or forgotten herself and damaged her own case? Moreover, would she really have thought that 200-plus lines would constitute a more effective plea than a poem of half or indeed less than

¹ The personal reminiscences are those of JBH alone. The views expressed thereafter are shared by all three editors.

² In *Ovid recalled*, 97, he writes: 'Nearly all the *Heroides* are too long; the shortest extends to 116 lines, and the average is about 190.' A table of line-numbers past and present follows this Introduction.

half that length? Less is often more.

L. P. Wilkinson, regrettably, was not explicit on the matter of length, but we wonder if he had found, as we have, that long stretches of the exchanges between Paris and Helen were redolent more of the demi-monde of the Subura than of the first beginnings of a correspondence between a visiting prince from Troy and a divinely born queen of Sparta. The clear reference to having anal sex with Helen in 16.161-162, the drooling recollection of a view of the queen's exposed breasts in 16.249ff., the suggestion of a one-night stand at 16.283-284, the insulting remarks about king Menelaus at 16.301ff. – could such lines have been intended by Ovid to stand in what purports to be the very first approach from Paris to his goddess-given wife-to-be?³

Other passages, then, in other letters, came crowding in to mind; passages not indeed so sensational as those in Paris' letter, but still disturbing to a disposition inclined to look upon the letters as letters intended to be sent and read (but see below about *Ep.* 9). Why, for instance, would Penelope be writing to tell Ulysses, of all people, about the post-bellum look of the land in the Troad? Why would she claim responsibility for Telemachus' mission to Pylos when, as everybody would have known, it was Athena who had sent him? How could Phaedra have been so stupid as to propose adultery to Hippolytus, *tout court*, near the start of her letter, and not rather have been evasive about her designs on him? Would Hercules really have relished repeated lists of his labours in a letter from Deianira aiming to win him back from his passion for Iole? (An unusual letter, incidentally, in having a postscript about the poisoned garment, from which it is plain that this letter, unlike the others in the collection, was never sent.) Just one more case now. Would Hypermestra really have included a lengthy digression about the fortunes of Io, who was not a relative, in a letter begging her spouse Lynceus to come and rescue her from the condemned cell and imminent death?

Already in the sixteenth century the great Joseph Justus Scaliger had

³ Sometimes indeed we wonder whether we have not in both the Paris and the Helen letters traces of projected second letters written in response to the ostensibly first letters we now have. That would explain the oscillation between his courtly restraint and her indignation, and his overt sexuality and her coyness ('I'd like to, but I daren't').

opined that this particular digression should be excised from the letter; and the weight of his influence had also been brought to bear against the authenticity of the double epistles 16-21. Since his time a considerable number of the single epistles also have been condemned as spurious, the culmination of this process being reached by Karl Lachmann's impugning of nos 3, 8, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15 as well as 16-21, nos 8, 9, 14, 16, 17 and 19 with absolute confidence, nos 3, 12, 13, 18 and 20 with rather less assertiveness. In Lachmann's view only those epistles can safely be regarded as genuine which are mentioned in *Am.* 2.18, except that the Sappho-letter there mentioned is not the Sappho-letter we now have. The additional lines in no. 16 and the final lines of no. 21 are peremptorily swept aside by him, and letters doomed to the axe are sentenced for showing a 'pauperem exilis ingenii uenam' ('an impoverished vein of slender wit') or a 'molestam quandam et exuberantem orationis abundantiam' ('a kind of troublesome and supererogatory abundance of verbiage'). This is hardly a fair trial; and it is about time scholars stopped genuflecting to flimsy argumentation supported only by a famous name.

The Sappho-letter, no.15, indeed has long now been a bone of contention, not least because it has descended to us along its own stream of transmission, apart from the other letters; and we see no sign of an end to the squabbling, about this and other poems, because the squabbling, when it is not in fact about a corrupt text, is ultimately founded on subjective criteria, or criteria twisted to support subjective or tendentious or preconceived positions.

A word or two may be said about such criteria, and in particular about quadrisyllabic endings to the pentameter. It is fact that there is a high frequency of such endings in the *Tristia* and *Ex Ponto*, but there are only three in the rest of Ovid, and they are all in the double epistles.⁴ Go one stage further, now, and say that such endings are not found before the period of exile, and it will follow either that such endings indicate composition in the period of exile or that the distichs in which they appear were not the work of Ovid.⁵ But it is begging the question to say that such endings are not found before the period of exile. Our position is that they were either written by Ovid who chose for the

⁴ 16.288 *pudicitiae*, 17.16 *superciliis*, 19.202 *deseruit*. See Platnauer, *Latin elegiac verse* 17 and Kenney, Introduction to ed. 21-23.

⁵ As it happens, line 16.288 is one of our *uersus exclusi*.

nonce to ignore a law of usage which he himself had established, or, if we exclude the lines in question on other grounds, were written by composers unaware that there was such a 'law' or not concerned to observe it. Professor Kenney defends the polysyllabic endings as authentic on literary grounds.

Unusual usages, of language or metre, do not weigh with us as criteria of authenticity; and neither does the treatment of *Am.* 2.18 as though it were a full and complete catalogue of Ovid's *Heroides*. *Am.* 2.18 is a poem, not an inventory; and we are not entitled to infer from it that *Her.* 1, 2, 4-7, 10, 11 and 15, because they and they alone are alluded to in it, were the only *Heroides* that Ovid ever wrote. Nor, because double epistles are not mentioned there or anywhere else, are we constrained to believe that Ovid never wrote the double epistles. The fact that he never mentions them shows only that he found no occasion to mention or allude to them. Our view is that they were produced fairly smartly in response to the challenge presented by his friend Sabinus' writing replies to single epistles. What cheek, thought Ovid. Well, I'll show him. And hey presto, three pairs of double epistles. The idea that amatory poetry might have been written by a man exiled on the Black Sea coast for a 'carmen et error' strikes us as quite beyond belief.

From the large-scale athetising of Karl Lachmann it was not so distant a step to the wholesale athetising of the entire collection of single epistles, as has now been proposed by Wilfried Lingenberg following in the footsteps of Otto Zwierlein. We have no time for their way of reasoning. Ovid was a prolific composer, and it seems somehow inevitable that he would have reused ideas and sometimes had more success with them the second time round; to base any relative chronology on subjective judgements about repetitions seems to us a dubious procedure. At the other extreme from the abolitionists stand the traditionalists, for whom all of the poems are genuine, though not without their share of interpolated lines.⁶ Our position is that all twenty-one poems are genuine, but that all of them have reached their present forms by a process of what may be called collaborative

⁶ We may here say that we do not consider any of the introductory distichs examined by Kirfel to be genuine.

composition.⁷ Thus, an original⁸ poem of about one hundred lines by Ovid begins to be augmented by the addition or insertion of lines either written by him but designed for another place or not designed for any place but composed in a fit of inventive exuberance and left in his desk drawer, or written by another person or other persons and designed to bulk out the original treatment in a variety of ways: by ‘sexing up’, by variation on a theme, by supplying biographical data, by introducing *exempla* from mythology, by generally filling in background to the letter and the letter-writer. The initial impulse to make the letters longer will have come from a widely held feeling, the opposite feeling indeed to that of L. P. Wilkinson, that it was a pity that the original versions were too short: ‘They are wonderful compositions. I wish they were longer.’ When this procession of expansion started is anybody’s guess, but there is no reason for not supposing it was in or shortly after Ovid’s own time. Ovid’s many literary friends included Sabinus, Macer, Rabirius, and Albinovanus Pedo; and others too are mentioned in the last poem of the collection *Ex Ponto*. Who can tell but that one or many of them may have been moved to add their contribution to the letter-collection? This supplementary material, whenever and by whomever it was produced, we endeavour to identify and to set apart from what we think is the original core at the end of the poem in question, and to verses so set apart we apply the term *uersus exclusi*. Of the justification for our exclusions, which include a considerable number of distichs previously impugned by others, we say something in the relevant notes in the apparatus; but we have there been brief. Even lengthy notes will not convince those who are not open to being convinced.

⁷ R. J. Tarrant uses the expression ‘collaborative interpolation’ in *Editing Greek and Latin texts* 121-162.

⁸ We need to clarify our use of the term ‘original’. Obviously, any writer will have second thoughts, revise, revise back, listen and react to critics, and so on; and we presume Ovid chopped and changed also. Any form of words which at some time or other appealed to him will count as ‘original’ with us. What we print is what we think was his last thought, or at least his last surviving thought.

Appendix 1: the total number of verses in the poems

The first number is that of all previous editions; the second is that of the lines now excluded; the total not excluded follows the sign of equality:

Penelope (1)	116-38 = 78
Phyllis (2)	148-54 = 94
Briseis (3)	154-64 = 90
Phaedra (4)	176-98 = 78
Oenone (5)	158-46 = 112
Hypsipyle (6)	164-56 = 108
Dido (7)	198-124 = 74 ⁹
Hermione (8)	122-54 = 68
Deianira (9)	168-72 = 96
Ariadne (10)	150-70 = 80
Canace (11)	128-24 = 104
Medea (12)	212-114 = 98
Laodamia (13)	166-86 = 80
Hypermetra (14)	132-48 = 84
Sappho (15)	220-90 = 130
Paris (16)	378-236 = 142 ¹⁰
Helen (17)	268-146 = 122
Leander (18)	218-120 = 98
Hero (19)	210-116 = 94
Acontius (20)	242-134 = 108
Cydippe (21)	248-134 = 114

⁹ Including 97a-97b.

¹⁰ Excluding the spurious couplet *cum Venus et Iuno*.

Appendix 2: some thoughts on the circumstances and tenor of the letters

Penelope (1) writes during Ulysses' absence in the hope that a letter urging him to return will somehow reach him. She has heard about Troy from the returning combatants, and is not going to tell him what he well knows. She needs his help in dealing with the suitors, and she names names. Ulysses' father is now old, his son Telemachus a mere boy, and she a defenceless woman. All three need his aid.

Phyllis (2) has been abandoned by Demophoon, and she knows the separation is final. She reproaches him for his breach of faith, reminds him of all she did for him, and tells him she intends to take her own life. Perhaps her body will be washed ashore for him to bury.

Briseis (3) wants Achilles to ask for her back, to be with him in Troy or to go as his captive, if not his wife, to Greece, if he is intending to return. He could ask for her, so why does he not?

Phaedra (4) writes in Troezen where Hippolytus is also. She is in a more delicate position than any other of the heroines. She is in love with her stepson, who is asexual, and she must be careful what she says, otherwise she will put him off altogether. Least of all is she going to propose straight out that they enter into an adulterous relationship. (Euripides' Phaedra, let us remember, never makes direct contact with Hippolytus.) She hopes to win him by emphasising her new-found interest in country sports and by reminding him that he and she have both been injured by Theseus and owe him nothing. She is at all points careful in mentioning love, and she is not brazenly cynical about morality. One final point. The expression 'step-mother' may to us sometimes seem to have something of the Wicked Witch about it, but there is no reason for us to think that there was a great difference in age between Phaedra and Hippolytus. He is Theseus' son by the Amazon, and she is Theseus' second wife, with little children, so she might not have been older than twenty; early marriage for girls was of course regular in antiquity.

Oenone (5), who was married to Paris when he was still a poor shepherd, knows that Paris has returned with Helen, but hopes to win him back by reminding him of their happy times together, by urging

him to think of the danger of this new relationship, and by emphasising her own fidelity in contrast to Helen's infidelity.

Hypsipyle (6) has been abandoned by Jason, who has now married Medea. He is back in Thessaly; she is still on Lemnos, with two children by Jason. Her letter is full of threats against both Jason and Medea, but how the threats might be put into action is not indicated. No reply is expected.

Dido (7) has learned that Aeneas is planning to leave her, and tries to stop him, if only until the weather is better for sailing. The swan-song with which she opens is ominous. She harps on the dangers unknown that he seems determined to encounter. She dwells on what she has given up for him, and what she has given him. As the last card she has to play, she tells him that she is thinking of taking her own life if he does leave her. We know the ending. Familiarity with Virgil will have inspired the interpolators to much activity in this poem in particular.

Hermione (8) has been given in marriage by her father Menelaus to Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles, who holds her captive and is mistreating her, she alleges, when she should have been married to her cousin Orestes, as her grandfather Tyndareus had intended when he betrothed her to Orestes. She appeals to Orestes to come and rescue her. She says that she will die if she does not have him for her husband.

Deianira (9) writes a letter which uniquely has a postscript and could not have been sent at all. She knows that her husband is now entangled with Iole, and scolds him for his unbecoming conduct in other affairs also, dwelling at particular length on Omphale. She does not waste time by reminding him of his labours; he knows what he has done. The postscript contains the dreadful news that the tunic she had sent Hercules as a love-charm is in fact steeped in deadly poison; and she declares her intention of dying as well.

Ariadne (10) has been abandoned on Naxos. She dwells at length on her betrayal by Theseus and the solitary isolation he has left her in. She will die all alone; but why has he done this to her after all she has done for him?

Canace (11) has had a child through her incestuous union with her brother Macareus, and has been condemned to death by her father,

while the baby has been taken away to be exposed. She hopes that Macareus somehow can save her, but, if not, he is to bury her together with the remains of his infant son.

Medea (12) writes to Jason who has expelled her from his house in Corinth. She reminds him of all that she has done for him, dwelling particularly on the first beginnings of their relationship and his promises to her then, and begs him to come back to her, if not for herself then for the sake of their two children. She pointedly does not mention Creusa. She does not threaten; that would be counter-productive. She just wants Jason back.

Laodamia (13), recently married to Protesilaus, writes to her husband who is now at Aulis with the fleet, exhorting him to take care of himself and contrive to be the last to land at Troy. She has nocturnal visions of calamity. We know that he will be the first of the Greeks to fall. She has an image of him by her bedside to which she speaks in the absence of her man. She swears that she will follow him, whether to death or to life.

Hypermetra (14) writes to her newly-wed husband Lynceus after the bloodbath at Argos has carried off all his brothers murdered by all her sisters. Her theme is *pietas*. She has been imprisoned by her father for letting Lynceus escape, and she knows what is in store for her. She hopes that Lynceus may be able to rescue her, or at least perform the funeral rites over her after her death. She does not tell the story of Io; that is an interpolation.

In 15 Sappho writes to her former lover Phaon who has gone off to Sicily. She distances herself from lesbian love and concentrates only on him. She wants him to return, but, if he will not, she will leap from the Leucadian cliff to find a cure for unrequited passion. We do not know the sequel.

We do however know the sequel to the pair of letters 16-17. Paris is in Sparta, has seen Helen at a banquet given by her husband Menelaus, and, now that Menelaus has gone off to Crete, ventures to write to her for the first time. His letter is courteous and suave, the sort of letter a visiting prince might be expected to write to a queen; it does not contain anything vulgar, and it is not too overtly sexual, though it does of course propose elopement. It makes a point of emphasising that

Paris' quest is divinely sanctioned. It does not make fun of, let alone abuse, Menelaus.

Helen's reply is initially haughty and indignant, but it mellows as it progresses, while remaining dignified and queenly. She acknowledges that she has been chosen by Venus, and condescends to give his proposal serious thought and take the advice of her ladies-in-waiting, Aethra and Clymene.

The exchanges between Leander and Hero (18-19) are essentially straightforward. He is in Abydos, prevented by stormy seas from swimming across to Sestos to be with his lover. His letter is mostly taken up with the famous and beautiful narrative of their first meeting in Sestos. Both of them lament the obstacles to their meeting, and speculate about their chances of getting together soon.

Finally, 20 and 21. Acontius, a native of Cea (Ceos), is in love with Cydippe, a girl from Naxos (so Callimachus). She is lying sick at home, and he is staying somewhere nearby (20.129-130). When they both visited Delos, the naive Cydippe had read the writing on the apple rolled towards her by Acontius and by reading it had sworn in the temple of Diana to marry Acontius; her parents however have found her a fiancé of their own choosing. Cydippe is visited by sickness for not keeping her oath; Acontius urges her not to offend Diana. She feels she must respect her parents' wishes, but tells how illness has changed her appearance in consequence. In the end, however, she gives in and says 'Come'.

As Penelope had written VENIAS in the last line of her letter, so Cydippe writes VENI in the last line of hers.

The line numbering of the poems is the standard numbering (as for example in G. P. Goold's revised Loeb edition); excisions and transpositions in the text, while fully and faithfully recorded in the databank, do not affect the strictly numerical sequence followed in the databank. There will thus be no difficulty in finding information relating to this line or that.

Volumes 2, 3 and 4 offer full collations of all the oldest manuscripts (pre-1400) and a number of fifteenth-century manuscripts, together with a full repertory of known conjectures; this databank contains the materials for a properly critical apparatus. Begun on a limited scale, the full extent of the enterprise was made possible only by the munificence of the Loeb Classical Library Foundation which most generously provided funds for the purchase of photographic material from all over Europe and also from the USA. To the Foundation therefore and its Trustees go our most grateful thanks.

JBH

†ALR

MJE

Catalogue of manuscripts

JBH has collated all the manuscripts listed below, except for two now lost or destroyed, namely Ep and Sp; readings of these lost manuscripts are taken as indicated from the source(s) named in each case. Manuscripts which do not appear either in Doerrie's main list (*Untersuchungen* I (1960) 120-124) or the supplementary one (*Untersuchungen* III (1972) 281-283) are marked by an asterisk. After presenting the supplementary manuscripts Doerrie briefly discusses identification of Heinsius' manuscripts (284-285) and then (286) lists the changes of sigla he made after entering into communication with Professor E. J. Kenney. I hereafter employ the terms U I, U II and U III for the three parts (1960, 1960 and 1972) of Doerrie's *Untersuchungen*, and 'ed.' for his edition (1971), where a 'Conspectus codicum' is given on 12-19. The sign + after the siglum indicates that the manuscript is used by Doerrie in the constitution of his text, on which matter see U III 286-290.

(i) Manuscripts containing the main collection of letters, including the fragmentary manuscripts discussed by Doerrie in U III 288-290:

- Ab+** Londiniensis Bibl. Brit. Add. 21169, s. xiii. Minutely written in two long columns. Begins at 2.8. B in Giomini and U I and II, Ab in U III and ed.
- Aw** Antuerpiensis 124 (141), a. 1302. Omits 8.106-9.133.
- Ax** Antuerpiensis 112 (135), s. xiii/xiv. Ends at 17.234. 'Christophorus Plantinus Theodoro Pulmanno D. D. / Kalendis Ianuariis, Anno M.D.LXIII' (f. 1).
- Az+** Engelbergense fragmentum (Anglimontanus) 94, fos 7-8, s. xiii/xiv, certainly not xi-xii. Contains 19.144-210 and 20.1-6, 155-228. S in Giomini, Doerrie's Az and f 8 in ed.
- B+** Bernensis 478, s. xii ex. Bc in Doerrie's U I and II, B in ed. Lost 'probably in the years 1945/1951, just before the foundation of the Burgerbibliothek Bern' according to F. Mittenhuber of the BBB, but the library has a microfilm and so does the IRHT. Begins at 8.41 (not 39 as Doerrie says). Doerrie (U I 120 and ed. 13) notes that G. Wartenberg

published a collation in *Wochenschrift f. klass. Philologie* (1887) 1272-1278, 1366-1371, 1464-1468. See F. Munari in *SIFC* 23 (1948) 148, 1.

- Bas Basileensis F IV 17, s. xiv. Heinsius' Basileensis.
- Be Bernensis 512, a. 1289.
- Bi+ Berolinensis DBS 1, s. xiii/xiv, not s. xiii as Doerrie thinks. A relative of Hel.
- Bla Berolinensis DBS 7, s. xiii/xiv.
- Blb+ Berolinensis DBS 14, s. xiv. This is Heinsius' Relandinus, and was collated by Bentley (1662-1742, not, as Doerrie states, ed. p. 13 '1622-1712'). Bn in ed.
- Blc Berolinensis DBS 24, s. xiv (ends at 16.268). The Intimelianus of Heinsius, as Doerrie rightly observes at 17.240. On f. 1 has the inscription 'Donum P. Angeli Aprosii Vintimiliani'.
- Bld* Berolinensis DBS 8, s. xv. Heinsius' 'codex chartaceus'.
- Bln Berolinensis 209 (Phillipps 1797), s. xiv. Bicolumnar.
- Blq Berolinensis lat. qu. 467, s. xiv. The writing of this manuscript is evanescent, the order of pages confused. No inferences from silence are to be made about readings.
- Br Bruxellensis 14791, s. xiii ex., not s. xiv. Ends at 19.149 (not 18.149 as Doerrie says, U I 121).
- Bx+ Bruxellensis 21368, s. xii/xiii. Lacks 12.33-205 and 20.141-228. A more recent hand has written 1.1-42 again because the first hand giving 1.1-40 is almost illegible. The first hand ends at 20.140 (f. 39v); a more recent hand has added 20.229-242 and 21.1-12. Provenance: Tournai.

- Ca+** Cantabrigiensis Coll. S. Trinitatis R.3.18 (598), s. xiii med./ex. Has lost 10.76-12.140 and ends at 20.229. Ca in U I and II, C in U III and ed. Bentley's Dunelmensis.
- Cd** Cantabrigiensis Vniuersitatis Add. 7221, s. xiii.
- Cz+** Cantabrigiensis Gouillanus et Caianus 803-807, s. xiii. Fragment containing 7.107-165. Doerrie's Cz and f 5 in ed.
- D+** Diuionensis 497, s. xii/xiii. Minutely written with three long columns to the page. Doerrie says (ed. p. 13) that this is Heinsius' 'exemplar Iureti' (F. Juret 1553-1626), but D rarely coincides with the 'Excerpta Iureti'.
- Dc+** Dresdensis Dc 142, s. xiii. Readings excerpted for C. T. Kuinoel by J. G. Reiff. Engelbrecht is not correct in saying that this manuscript was 'In 1945 vernichtet'; it survives, but it has suffered much damage and is frequently illegible: see Doerrie's remarks, ed. p. 17. Dp in Doerrie's sigla.
- E+** Etonensis 6.5 (150), s. xi. The script is of the Bari type: see E. A. Loew, *The Beneventan script*, 152. Perhaps written in the Abruzzi: see Reeve in *Texts and transmission*, 396. Contains 1.1-7.159.
- Ea+** Etonensis 6.18 (91), s. xiii. Heinsius' Iunianus. I in U I and II, Ea in U III and ed.
- Ep+** Erfurtanus Amplonianus, s. xiii, now lost. Ended at 17.98. Collated by Kuinoel, whose collation is copied by Loers. I only cite this manuscript when the reading is reported explicitly.
- Ez+** Erfurtanus Bibl. Ciu. fol. 9a, s. xii². Two double leaves, containing 1.60-86, 89-116, 3.95-124, 126-154, 18.13-49, 50-86, 20.102-138, 139-176. Doerrie's Ez and f 1 in ed.

- F+** Francofurtanus Bibl. Vniu. MS Barth. 110, s. xii med./ex. Belonged to Naugerius. Bicolumnar. Contains the *Epistula Sapphus* (on ff. 133va-134vb), separately from the main collection (on ff. 136ra-158rb).
- Fa+** Laurentianus 24 sin. 8, s. xiii. Fa in U I and II, N in U III and ed.
- Fc** Laurentianus 36.27, s. xiv. Heinsius' alter Mediceus. This MS has the ending to poem 21 (starting at verse 8 on a new page and continuing to 248) added by a later hand, but it does not add poem 15. It also omits altogether poems 4 and 5.
- Fd*** Laurentianus 36.28, s. xiv. On this manuscript see R. Black in Clark J. G. (2011) at 140-141.
- Fe*** Laurentianus 36.29, s. xiv. Omits 9.12-11.83 and 13.2-133.
- Ff*** Laurentianus 36.30, s. xv.
- Fg*** Laurentianus 38.08, 20 Sept. 1415.
- G+** Guelferbytanus Extrau. 260, s. xii. Barely legible in many places, so no inferences from silence are to be made about readings.
- Gi+** Gissensis Bibl. Acad. 66 (Senckenbergianus), s. xiii med.-ex., not xiv. Much information in Peters 8ff. Collated by H. Roesse (1913). This is the Mentelianus alter of Heinsius. Gis in U I and II, Gi in ed. JBH collated it initially from microfilm, then much later (2019) from a digitised reproduction which made clear many places previously dark.
- Gp+** Gothanus Bibl. Ciu. II 120, s. xii (older part), xii/xiii (slightly more recent part containing 1.1-7.92, 10.69-11.2). Collated by Kuinoel. Gp in U I and II, Go in U III and ed. Not burned in 1945, as Doerrie erroneously says (U I 121).
- Gr*** Gothanus bibl. ciu. II 57, s. xiii/xiv. Collated by Kuinoel.

- Gud+** Guelferbytanus Gudianus 297, s. xv. Has the text as far as 21.144. Heinemann in the Wolfenbuettel catalogue assigned the MS to s. xvi. JBH does not find this credible. In the view of W. Engelbrecht, this manuscript was copied from the edition of 1478 (Iacobus de Marliano) of which there is a copy in the University Library at Goettingen. JBH does not think it was so copied. The clinching proof is that Gud shares with *Pac* alone a number of egregious errors, the most striking of which is *caes* for *caelo sed* at 18.169. Doerrie gives details of the manuscript in U I 179ff. Gud in U I and II, Gu in U III and ed.
- Har** Haruardiensis Houghton 124 (L 25), s. xv. Ends at 21.144. Described by E.K. Rand (1904). See U III 283.
- Hel*** Guelferbytanus Helmaestadiensis 336, a. 1450. A relative of Bi. Some of its readings were collected by Wideburg.
- Hol** Holkhamicus 319 (now in the Bibliotheca Wormsleiana in the keeping of the Curators of the Bodleian Library), s. xiv. In a poor state and frequently illegible. Omits 17.200-18.54.
- K+** Hauniensis Gl. kgl. S. 2013, s. xiii. Identical with Nic. Heinsius' Gortorphanus, but not the Hafniensis. C in Giomini, Ko in U I and II, K in U III and ed.
- Kr*** Cremifanensis 149, s. xv in.
- L+** Louaniensis 411, s. xii. Destroyed in the Second World War, but the IRHT has a microfilm. Contains 1.1-9.133.
- La** Londiniensis Harleianus 2709, s. xiii.
- Lb** Londiniensis Burneianus 219, s. xiii.
- Ld** Londiniensis Add. 30862, s. xiii ex., not xiv.
- Led** Leidensis BPL 153, s. xii/xiii, not xiv. Collation by Burgersdijk (1899).

- Lei Leidensis BPL 163, s. xiii med. Belonged to Gronovius. Collation by Burgersdijk (1899).
- Len Leidensis BPL 191d, s. xiii med./ex. (multi-part manuscript, with St James Liège as the home library for at least the first part). *Her.* on ff. 65r-102v, followed by *Ex Ponto*. Collation by Burgersdijk (1899).
- Liv Liuerpudlensis bibl. uniu. F 3.6 (ex-Postgate, bequest 1926; formerly Phillipps 4199), s. xiv ex. Listed by a previous bookseller as '315. ... *Spain, about 1420*'.
- Lo Londiniensis Harleianus 2758, s. xiv.
- Lp* Londiniensis Add. 17408, a. 1411.
- Lq* Londiniensis Add. 39651, s. xv. Contains 21 up to 144. Also has the *Epistula Sapphus*.
- Lr* Londiniensis Harleianus 2617, s. xv.
- Ls Londiniensis Harleianus 2565, s. xv. Contains the whole collection including 16.39-144 and 21.13-248. In the opinion of Palmer (157-158) the extra lines were copied from the Parma edition. There are however a number of departures from the Parma throughout this manuscript, and I do not see why it should not be earlier than the Parma. Contains the *Epistula Sapphus*.
- Lt* Londiniensis Add. 11974, s. xv. Shows a close affinity to the 1478 edition, but is not copied from it. Stops at 20.73.
- M+ Florentinus Marcianus 235, s. xii ex.
- Ma Matritensis 1569 (M 62), s. xiii.
- Me Laurentianus 36.2, s. xv. Contains *Her.* up to 21.144 (146), followed by *Epistula Sapphus*. Heinsius' Mediceus. Laur in Doerrie's *Untersuchungen*; not used for his text.
- Med Mediolanensis O. 138 sup., s. xiv.

- Mg Mediolanensis E. 84 sup., s. xiii/xiv. Doerrie's Me. Collated for me in situ by Dr Gabriele Sarti because it could not be photographed.
- Mi+ Mediolanensis I. 8 inf., s. xiii. Once at Avignon. The old hand begins at 1.71; a later hand has added 1.1-70.
- Mln Mediolanensis P. 73 sup., s. xiv.
- Mlt* Mediolanensis Triultianus 639, s. xiv med.-ex. (s. xv according to the printed catalogue by G. Porro 324: s. xiii according to Coulson and Roy 147, wrongly). It ends at 13.44.
- Mm Monacensis clm 818 (Vict. 152), s. xiii/xiv.
- Mn+ Monacensis clm 23481, s. xiii, not xiv. I in Doerrie's sigla in U III 281. Note: this siglum (I) had already been assigned in U I and II to the Etonensis Ea.
- Mo* Monacensis clm 29208/19 (olim 29007), s. xii. Contains 7.178-196, 8.3-101. Provenance: Oberaltaich.
- Mp* Monacensis clm 5669, s. xv. Padua, 1472.
- Mtr* Matritensis 1482, s. xv. U III 283. I occasionally cite this manuscript for poem 21 from the edition by Moya del Baño (1986).
- Mu+ Monacensis clm 4612 (1237), s. xii/xiii. Provenance: Benediktbeuern. Mu in U I and II, H in U III and ed.
- Mz+ Monacensis clm 8123 (Mallerst. 3), s. xii ex., not xiii. Contains in this order 1.1-4.140, 10.119-18.31, 4.141-5.103, 7.58-7.196, 18.32 to 21.12. Omits entirely 5.104-7.57 and 8.1-10.118.
- Monacensis clm 19475, s. xii, ff. 16rb-31vb. From Tegernsee. Commentary only, edited by Hexter (1986).
- Ne Neapolitanus IV F 15 (Borb. 263), s. xii/xiii not xiii/xiv.

- Ny Noueboracensis Pierpont Morgan M. 810, ca. 1360. Written in Florence.
- Ob+** Oxoniensis Bodl. Canon. class. lat. 1, s. xiii. O in U I and II, Ob in U III and ed.
- Oc Oxoniensis Bodl. Canon. class. lat. 10, s. xiv.
- Od Oxoniensis Bodl. Canon. class. lat. 14, s. xiv.
- Oe Oxoniensis Bodl. Canon. class. lat. 8, s. xiv. Ob in U I.
- Of+ Oxoniensis Bodl. Rawlinson G 99, s. xiii. Poems 10 to 14 appear between 17 and 18. Given to St Albans by Abbot John of Wheathampstead.
- Og Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct. F I 17, s. xiii.
- Oh* Oxoniensis Coll. Balliolensis 143, s. xiii/xiv.
- On* Oxoniensis Bodl. Rawlinson G 100, s. xiv ex. Ends at 19.208. No. 313 in the *Poetae* in quarto in the sale catalogue (1682) of N. Heinsius' library.
- Os* Oxoniensis Bodl. Auct. Lat. class. d. 8, s. xiv ex. Written in Italy by Battista Sansone. A few readings recorded from the first page.
- Ow Oxoniensis Coll. Aedis Christi 507, s. xiii/xiv. Belonged to S. G. Owen, who wrote about it in *CQ* 30 (1936) 155-169 and 31 (1937) 1-15.
- Oz+ Oxoniensis Bodl. Canon. class. lat. 98, s. xiv. A fragment containing 6.1-63. Doerrie's Oz and f 4 in ed.
- P+** Parisinus latinus 8242, s. ix^{2/3}. Provenance: St Peter Corbie. This manuscript does not have: 1.1-2.13; 4.48-103; 5.97-6.49; 20.176-21.12. It does have: 2.14-4.47; 4.104-5.96; 6.50-20.175. Doerrie U I 186-188 has some useful remarks on the composition of this manuscript. See also B. Bischoff, 'Hadoardus and the Manuscripts of Classical Authors from

Corbie', in *Didascaliae: studies in honor of Anselm M. Albareda*, ed. S. Prete, New York 1961, 39-57, at 52-53, where the date 'middle and the third quarter of the 9th century' is given for this and other Corbie MSS.

- Pa+ Parisinus latinus 7993, s. xii ex./xiii in. Heinsius' alter Regius. Written minutely in three long columns.
- Pb+ Parisinus latinus 7994, s. xiii. Contains 9.36-21.12, but omits 19.148-20.15. This is Heinsius' Mentelianus prior. Doerrie's Pm in U I and II, Pb in U III and ed.
- Pc Parisinus latinus 7999, s. xiv.
- Pd Parisinus latinus 7995, s. xiii/xiv.
- Pe Parisinus latinus 7996, s. xiv.
- Pg* Parisinus latinus 8243, a. 1387. Contains the *Epistula Sapphus*, and, after F, antedates all the manuscripts which contain this letter separately from the rest of the Epistles. Heinsius' Regius.
- Pk Parisinus Aresnalis 894. 41 BL, s. xiv. Contains 1.1-2.23, 4.8-5.47, 7.157-12.109, 16.31-21.12.
- Pm+ Parmensis Palat. 2661, a. 1364. Begins at 7.107, and at the beginning is much damaged by staining. Pm in U III 281, Pv in text. Note: Pm had previously been used by Doerrie for Pb.
- (Pn) Parisinus latinus 15146, s. xiv + s. xiii in. See under the siglum U, which it has in Doerrie's ed.
- Po Poppiensis 31, s. xiv.
- Pr Pragensis bibl. nat. 1645 (VIII.H.27), a. 1387.
- Ps Pragensis bibl. nat. 1647 (VIII.H.29), s. xiv.
- Pt+ Pragensis bibl. nat. 1630 (VIII.H.12), s. xii. Lacks 20.16-143. R in U I-III and ed.

- Pv+** Papiensis Aldini 227, s. xiv, not xiii. It is of a similar age and in a similar script to St. Contains 4.151-16.349, 17.43-186 and 17.259-21.12. Bound with the next item.
- Pvz+** Papiensis Aldini 227, s. xiv. A fragment containing 1.66-2.20 and 3.152-4.66. Doerrie's Pvz and f 2 in ed.
- Pyz+** Parisinus latinus 2692, s. xii. Doerrie's Pyz and f 3 in ed.
- Pz+** Parisinus Arsenalis 3219, a. 1357. Contains in this order 16.285-345 and 14.9-66. Doerrie's Pz and f 6 in ed.
- Q+** Antuerpiensis O.B.5.1 (lat. 68, formerly 43), s. xii ex. One of Heinsius' Moretani. A in Giomini's ed. and in U I and II, Q in U III and ed.
- R*** Romanus Angelicus 1060-III, s. xii², ff. 33v-95v.
- Re** Remensis 1259 (J. 735), s. xii/xiii.
- Ri+** Riccardianus 489, s. xiii, not xiv.
- Ric*** Riccardianus 699, s. xiv.
- Rid*** Riccardianus 737, s. xv. Begins at 4.76. Contains *Ep. Sapphus*.
- Rs** Romanus Sessorianus 109, s. xiv/xv.
- Rz+** Remensis 284 (180), s. xiii. A leaf extracted from a binding. Contains 18.101-194. The text is very smudged and to a large extent illegible. Doerrie's Rz and f 7 in ed.
- S** Laurentianus Strozianus 123, s. xii ex. Ends at 20.59.
- Sar+** Parisinus latinus 7997, s. xv. Ends at 21.144. Contains the *Epistula Sapphus* on ff. 32r-36r. Written by Bartolomeo Sanvito. Heinsius' Sarrauianus. Sar in Doerrie's sigla, Pc in Kenney's.
- Sh*** Sheffield, University Library 32, a. 1400-1425.

- Sp+ Argentoratensis Seminarii C V 27, s. xiii. Ended at 20.239. Collated by Loers (1829). Incinerated in 1870. No inferences from Loers's silence. Reeve reports a number of readings from Heinsius' collation.
- St Argentoratensis 285, s. xiv ex. Provenance: Venice, S. Francesco della Vigna.
- T+ Turonensis 879, s. xii ex.
- To Turonensis 881, s. xiii.
- Tr+ Treuirensis 1088/28, s. xiii. The foundation of Loers's text. Tr in U I and II, Y in U III and ed.
- Tv Taruisiensis 248, s. xiv ex.
- U+ Parisinus latinus 15146, s. xiv (1.1-5.59, 13.35-17.93) + s. xiii in. (18.1-21.12). See also under Pn, which is Doerrie's siglum in U I and II, but not in U III and ed. where it is U.
- Ucl Londiniensis Collegii Vniuersitatis Ogden 6, s. xiii in. Now conserved in The British Archives, Kew, London. Photographed in situ by P. A. Hall. Doerrie's Ac: see U III 281.
- Udz+ Vtinensis 836(824)A. Two fragments, (1) of s. xiv containing 14.117-16.203 (minus 15 and 16.39-144), and (2) of s. xiv containing 8.103-9.39. Doerrie's f. 10 and f. 9 in ed.: see U III 281-282.
- Urb Vrbinas lat. 347, s. xv. Clearly related to the Bologna edition (see for example 3.64, 65, 4.12, 61, 5.22. 6.19, 153) and largely but not entirely copied from it (see 2.141-142, 17.109-110); and it has some rarities, as at 2.91. Contains the *Epistula Sapphus*.
- V+ Vaticanus lat. 3254 (not 3252 as Doerrie states in his ed.; he is correct in *Untersuchungen*), s. xii. Ends at 17.236. Q in U I and II, V in U III and the ed. JBH has twice collated this manuscript.

- Va Vaticanus latinus 2791, s. xiv.
- Vb+ Vaticanus Barberinianus lat. 26, s. xiii in. Heinsius' Barberinianus.
- Vc Vaticanus lat. 2792, s. xiii/xiv. There are disordered verses: (f. 27v) 10.83-85, 148-150, 11. a-b, 1-18; (f. 28r) 10.86-115; (f. 28v) 10.116-147; (f. 29r) 11.19 etc.; (f. 45r) 17.7 is immediately followed by 10.86-90; (f. 45v) 10.91-118; (f. 46r) 10.119-146; (f. 46v) 10.147, 17.8 etc. Thus, 10.86-147 appear twice. I refer to the two versions as Vc¹ and Vc². The manuscript ends at 18.203.
- Ve Veronensis DCLXXXIX, s. xiv.
- Vh* Vaticanus lat. 1595, s. xv.
- Vo Vaticanus Ottobonianus latinus 1676, s. xiii. Contains 4.32-135, 6.15-19.66, 4.136 (= f.43)-6.14, 19.67-21.12.
- Vp* Vaticanus Palatinus latinus 1666, ff. 1-52v, s. xiii ex.
- Vpa Vaticanus Palatinus latinus 1707, s. xv. This is the 'uetustissimum exemplar' of Antonius Volscus, concerning whom see the beginning of poem 20 in our notes. Contains 16.39-144. Widely thought to have been copied from the ed. Vicentina of 1480, but, if that is so, why are 21.13-248 not present?
- Vpb* Vaticanus Palatinus latinus 1668, s. xv. Collated by Gebhardus: see Reeve (1974) 136.
- Vr Vaticanus Reginensis latinus 2080, s. xiv, not xiii as Doerrie opines. A fragment containing 1.1-4.31 (not 20) but largely illegible because of smudges and rubbing.
- Vro* Vaticanus Rossianus 893, s. xiv ex./xv in.
- W+ Vindobonensis nou. ser. 107, s. xi ex. Provenance: Mondsee. Written in two columns and seriously mutilated. The beginnings and ends of many verses have perished. Contains