

# Isaac Vossius' *Sylloge* of Greek Pattern Poems

Guillermo Galán-Vioque

**A**MONG THE NUMEROUS autograph Greek codices that belonged to the humanist Isaac Vossius (1618–1689), one that attracts particular attention is the present Leiden BU Vossius misc. 13 (hereafter 'Voss.'), since it contains the most extensive manuscript *sylloge* of Greek pattern poems known, with the exception of the one transmitted in the codex of the *Anthologia Palatina*, Heidelberg Pal.gr. 23 + Paris.gr. 384 (hereafter 'P').<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The second section of the primitive Palatine manuscript, in its present location in Paris (*Paris.gr.* 384 ff. 28–30<sup>v</sup>), contains the six Greek pattern poems that have come down to us, and all apart from the *'Doric' Altar* are accompanied by scholia, known as the ancient scholia to distinguish them from those of the Byzantine period, which are basically the work of two scholars, Manuel Holobolus (1240–1290) and John Pediasimus (ca. 1250–1325). Five Greek pattern poems were also contained in a now-lost manuscript from the library of the Iviron monastery on Mt. Athos (which omitted the *'Ionic' Altar*). It was described in detail by P. Uspenskij, *Pervoe puteshestvie v Afonskie monastyri i skity arkhimandrita* I.2 (Moscow 1877) 219. See C. Haeblerlin, "Epilegomena ad figurata carmina Graeca," *Philologus* 49 (1890) 275–276; C. Wendel, "Die Technopaegnien-Scholien des Rhetors Holobolos," *BZ* 19 (1910) 334–335; F. Sbordone, "Il commentario di Manuele Olobolo ai *Carmina figurata Graecorum*," in *Miscellanea Giovanni Galbiati* II (Milan 1951) 170; L. Ferreri, "Il commento di Manuele Olobolo all' *Ara Dorica* di Dosida. Storia della tradizione ed edizione critica," *Nea Rhome* 3 (2006) 319–321. Leiden Vossius gr. O 8 ff. 97–107 contains only four (*Egg*, *'Ionic' Altar*, *Axe*, all with scholia, and *Wings*). See wrongly R. Aubreton, "La tradition de l'*Anthologie Palatine* du XVI<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. II. La tradition française," *RHT* 11 (1981) 7, who includes the *'Doric' Altar*. This manuscript is absent from S. Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung und zum Verständnis der hellenistischen Technopaegnien* (Frankfurt am Main 2002).

---

*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 52 (2012) 284–309

© 2012 Guillermo Galán-Vioque

In fact, it contains on the recto of ff. 9–30 no fewer than five of the six pattern poems, many of them containing scholia and some even offering two different versions, as well as notes and scholia on the one figure poem not transcribed therein, the *Syrinx*. The verso of the folios, all left blank except ff. 32–40 (Petrus Gyllius' *Epistula ad amicum*), is used by Vossius to annotate the text occupying the recto of the following folio. The present arrangement of the *Sylloge Vossiana* is as follows:

- ff. 9–13 *'Ionic' Altar* with two versions of scholia
- f. 14 *'Doric' Altar*
- ff. 15–16 *Egg* with scholia
- f. 17 fragments of the *Wings* with scholia
- f. 18 *Axe*
- f. 18 notes on the *Syrinx*
- ff. 19–23 two versions of scholia on the *Syrinx*
- f. 24 *Wings* with scholia
- ff. 24–25 *Axe* with scholia
- ff. 26–27 two versions of scholia by Manuel Holobolus on the *Axe*
- ff. 28–30 *'Doric' Altar* with scholia by Holobolus

One may wonder why Vossius collected such poems with scholia of different origins. It is well known that he was wont to study, collate, and transcribe manuscripts in the libraries of the various cities he visited, particularly if the texts were unpublished.<sup>2</sup> This manuscript is another witness to this interest, since the present study of Vossius' sources reveals that he worked with manuscripts of very different origins and that the works he transcribed were for the most part as yet unpublished. He collected these texts—Greek pattern poems, but mainly scholia to these poems—from different libraries in Italy, where he travelled during the years 1641 to 1643,<sup>3</sup> in order to have them ready in case of need.

As we shall see, that need would arise later, in order to

<sup>2</sup> F. F. Blok, *Isaac Vossius and his Circle. His Life until his Farewell to Queen Christina of Sweden (1618–1655)* (Groningen 2000) 49 and 105 n.52.

<sup>3</sup> See Blok, *Isaac Vossius* 123–173.

criticise his master and former friend Claudius Salmasius.<sup>4</sup> The texts which Vossius transcribed in this manuscript were useful years later to mercilessly discredit the interpretations and comments of his master.

Voss. is a miscellaneous manuscript written on paper of 233 x 175 mm. It has 80 pages, 56 written and paginated in the upper right corner plus 24 blank.<sup>5</sup> It was written in its entirety by Isaac Vossius except for the index at f. 3<sup>v</sup>, entitled “Litt. M-2,” and ff. 32–40 which contain Petrus Gyllius’ *Epistola ad amicum*, dating from 1549 (f. 34<sup>v</sup>),<sup>6</sup> and the Latin *recensio minor* of the *Passio S. Perpetuae* with notes made by Vossius himself.<sup>7</sup> It

<sup>4</sup> On the conflict between Vossius and Salmasius, which either sprang from a misunderstanding concerning Christina of Sweden’s invitation to Heinsius and Salmasius to come to Stockholm ca. 1650 (Blok, *Isaac Vossius* 296–299, 344–350, 384–388), or else arose because Vossius entrusted Lucas Langermannus with the task of collating P in the Vatican (cf. F. Jacobs, *Ani-madversiones in epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae* [Leipzig 1798] I CXXXIX–CXLI), see specifically D. J. H. Ter Horst, *Isaac Vossius en Salmasius: Een episode uit de 17de-eeuwse geleerdengeschiedenis* (The Hague 1938).

<sup>5</sup> An exhaustive description in K. A. de Meyier, *Codices manuscripti VI Codices Vossiani Graeci et miscellanei* (Leiden 1955) 250–252.

<sup>6</sup> It is mentioned as an independent manuscript in P. Colomesius’ old catalogue, elaborated around the years 1682–1689, today’s Oxord Bodl. Tanner 271, see E. Bernard, *Catalogi librorum manuscriptorum Angliae et Hibernae in unum collecti* (Oxford 1697) II.1 69, no. 2661, 336 (= P. Colomesius, *Opera theologici, critici et historici argumenti* [Hamburg 1709] 885, no. 336): “Petri Gyllii Epistola de itinere suo Asiatico hactenus inedita.” It is no doubt the same manuscript since Colomesius says in his catalogue that A. Ortelius mentions this letter in his *Thesaurus geographicus* (Antwerp 1587) s.vv. “Dascuta” and “Nicomediensium lacum,” and at the latter there is even a direct quotation from this letter. There are other copies of this letter in the Vatican Library (Barb.lat. 2097) and in Paris (Dupuy 16), see P. O. Kristeller, *Iter italicum* II (Leiden 1967) 449, and L. Dorez, *Catalogue de la collection Dupuy* (Paris 1899) 19. It was first edited by P. Burman, *Sylloge epistolarum* II (Leiden 1727) 232–235, and later by C. Müller, *Geographi Graeci minores* II (Paris 1861) xii–xiv. There is a recent translation into French: J. P. Grémois, *Pierre Gilles. Itinéraires byzantins* (Paris 2007) 45–51.

<sup>7</sup> See C. I. M. I. van Beek, *Passio sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis* (Nijmegen 1936) 58–72 (textus A), and J. Amat, *Passion de Perpétue et de Félicité* (Paris

was acquired by the curators of the University of Leiden in 1690 from Vossius' heirs along with his whole library, 700 manuscripts and 4000 printed books,<sup>8</sup> and its presence is testified to in the university's library already in the 1716 catalogue, where it is mentioned among the manuscripts bound together by Vossius' heirs.<sup>9</sup>

Vossius was the copyist of some diverse annotations on f. 1; some drawings of marble altars (ff. 2<sup>v</sup>–3);<sup>10</sup> the anonymous epigram *Anth.Pal.* 9.48 and a fragment of Menander (fr.65 K.-A.),<sup>11</sup> both written at the bottom of f. 4;<sup>12</sup> the argument and

---

1996) 278–291 (text I). This manuscript is absent from both editions. The editio princeps, by Henricus Valesius, was published as an annex to L. Holstenius' *Passio sanctarum martyrum Perpetuae et Felicitatis* (Rome 1664) 78–87.

<sup>8</sup> *Catalogus scriptus librorum manuscriptorum et impressorum Isaci Vossii*, Leiden BPL 127 AF, f. 11, no. 107 (M-2 220 old signature added by another hand, probably the same that wrote the index of f. 3<sup>v</sup>), and ff. 24–25, no. M-2 220, CLXXXIII. This manuscript is a catalogue compiled in Windsor by Vossius' heirs around 1690 before the sale of his library. Voss. is also attested in Colomesius' previous catalogue: Bernard, *Catalogi librorum* II.1 60, no. 2220, 109 (= Colomesius, *Opera* 856, no. 109).

<sup>9</sup> W. Senguerdus, J. Gronovius, J. Heyman, *Catalogus librorum tam impressorum quam manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Publicae Universitatis Lugduno-Batauae* (Leiden 1716) 402, no. 13.

<sup>10</sup> After f. 3 six pages have been cut out and there remain only a few letters on the left margin. It seems that originally there was a Latin epistle: see de Meyier, *Codices manuscripti* VI 250.

<sup>11</sup> The play has not been identified. The fragment is transmitted in Stephanus Byzantius' *Ethnika* 250.5–10 M. s.v. Δωδώνη, and was consequently copied again on f.47 of Voss. with some variants.

<sup>12</sup> The middle section of the page has been carefully cut out and is missing. It appears that it was not lost when the 1690 catalogue was compiled, but is reported as missing already in the 1716 catalogue. The lost text can be identified with *IG XIV* 2128, a funerary epigram on a dog (= Peek, *GVI* 1365), since on the upper part of the page is written "Literae infrascripta repertae sunt apud S(an)ctum Felicem ad Emam in quadam marmorea tabula," and this title coincides, with minor variants, with the title of this epigram in MS. Florence Plut. XXIX.8 f. 45<sup>v</sup>, the famous Zibaldone Laurenziano (ZL): see G. Biagi, "Prefazione," *Lo Zibaldone Boccaccesco medico laurenziano plut. XXIX 8 riprodotto in facsimile* (Florence 1915) 4. Later Vossius

some conjectures on the text of Colutho's *De raptu Helenae* (ff. 5–6);<sup>13</sup> notes to Apollonius Rhodius *Argonautica*, taken from the Aldine edition (f. 7);<sup>14</sup> the epigram *Anth.Pal.* 9.748, with minor changes, and a tetrastichon attributed to an otherwise unknown Drimeus and copied from a Farnesian manuscript (f. 8);<sup>15</sup> the Greek pattern poems studied in this article (ff. 9–30); several conjectures to Ps.-Frontinus' *Liber coloniarum* (f. 31);<sup>16</sup> a fragment of Stephanus Byzantius' *Ethnika* (ff. 42–53);<sup>17</sup> and

---

edited it for the first time in his *Observationes ad Pomponium Melam De situ orbis* (The Hague 1658) 129–130, stating that he received it from L. Langermannus.

<sup>13</sup> There is an apograph of this text made by L. C. Valckenaer: Leiden BPL 495 II ff. 24–27. Colutho's editio princeps dates back to 1504–1505 at the Aldine press.

<sup>14</sup> Andreas Asolani's edition of the *Argonautica* was printed by the Aldine press in 1521.

<sup>15</sup> I have identified its antigraph as today's Naples II C 37, f. 381<sup>v</sup> (14–15<sup>th</sup> cent.), where this epigram has been copied *in calce* at the end of the *Batrachomyomachia*. See S. Cyrillus, *Codices Graeci mss. Regiae Bibliothecae* (Naples 1832) II 35, no. 96, who already printed this epigram, and E. Mioni, *Catalogus codicum Graecorum Bibliothecae nationalis Neapolitanae* I.1 (Rome 1992) 258, no. XVI. See also W. Hörandner, "Ein Zyklus von Epigrammen zu Darstellungen von Herrenfesten und Wunderszenen," *DOP* 46 (1992) 112. Vossius probably consulted this manuscript when he was in Rome from 3 May until 20 September 1642 (see Blok, *Isaac Vossius* 137 and 154), and thus this testimony can be considered as a terminus post quem for the transfer of the Farnesian manuscripts to Parma, which took place around the middle of the seventeenth century: see L. Pernot, "La collection de manuscrits grecs de la maison Farnèse," *MEFRM* 91 (1979) 466 and 478, and F. Fossier, *Le Palais Farnèse. Etude des manuscrits latins et en langue vernaculaire* (Rome 1982) 12.

<sup>16</sup> The editio princeps, probably used by Vossius for his notes, dates from 1563 (*Sex. Iulii Frontini de coloniis libellus* [s.l. n.d.]). See L. Toneatto, "L' editio princeps del *Liber regionum I*," *DArch SER.* III.1.1 (1983) 87–97; "Ancora sull' editio princeps del *Liber regionum I*: un aggiornamento degli annali aldini," *DArch SER.* III.3.2 (1985) 125–129; *Codices artis mensoriae. I manoscritti degli antichi opuscoli latini d' agrimensura (V–XIX sec.)* (Trieste 1994) I 66–67, III 1245–1246 (the author quotes here Vossius' notes).

<sup>17</sup> Steph. Byz. 240.12–259.3 M. It is an apograph of the unique copy of

some irrelevant final notes (ff. 54–56).

As it stands today, apart from the pages not copied by him that appear to be added later,<sup>18</sup> this manuscript looks like a notebook in which Vossius copied what he found of interest in the libraries he visited.

Vossius' *sylloge* of Greek *technopaegnia* (ff. 9–30) opens with a copy of the 'Ionic' *Altar* with scholia, metrical notes, and interlinear glosses by Holobolus, all faithfully transcribed from f. 144 of Ox.Bodl.D'Orville 71 (hereafter 'Orv.'). Like the Oxford manuscript, Vossius' copy lacks a title and is missing the four lines which usually accompany the scholia of Holobolus and are present in other witnesses of this recension such as Paris.gr. 2832 (= R) and Vat.gr. 434 (= Y): οὐ τῆς ἀθηνᾶς ... ἡ χάρις.<sup>19</sup>

Orv. is a Palaeologan manuscript of unknown origin, dated to the 14<sup>th</sup> century and written by different hands, which contains Hesiod's *Works and Days* (ff. 17–60<sup>v</sup>), with scholia and interlinear glosses and preceded by Proclus' *Prolegomena* (ff. 1–16); Pindar's *Olympics*, also with scholia (ff. 61<sup>v</sup>–118); a short selection of Theocritus' *Idylls* (*Id.* 1 to line 6, 4, 7, 8, and 10) (ff. 121–143); and the 'Ionic' *Altar* and the *Axe*, both with Holo-

---

the original work, today's Paris.Coisl. 228 ff. 116<sup>v</sup>–122<sup>v</sup> (11<sup>th</sup> cent.): see de Meyier, *Codices manuscripti* VI 251; A. Diller, "The Tradition of Stephanus Byzantinus," *TAPA* 69 (1938) 334–335 (= *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition* [Amsterdam 1983] 184–185); M. Billerbeck, *Stephani Byzantii Ethnika* I (Berlin 2006) 5–6. The missing text at 251–253 M. was already lost when Vossius copied this manuscript.

<sup>18</sup> In fact they are not mentioned in the old catalogue made by Colomesius and published later by Bernard, *Catalogi librorum* II.1 60, no. 2220, 109 (= Colomesius, *Opera* 856, no. 109), which reproduced the MS. Ox. Bodl.Tanner 271. They are first mentioned in the catalogue made by Vossius' heirs in 1690 (BPL 176 AF ff. 24–25). They are also attested in Senguerdius et al., *Catalogus librorum* 402, no. 13. See also n.8 above.

<sup>19</sup> See H. Omont, "Notice sur le manuscrit grec 2832 de la Bibliothèque nationale," *RevPhil* 28 (1904) 191; Wendel, *BZ* 19 (1910) 335. Wendel already pointed to this manuscript as a possible source in *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokrit-Scholien* (Berlin 1920) 179 n.1.

bolus' scholia (f. 144).<sup>20</sup> Its presence in d'Orville's library is testified to in Strackhoven's catalogue of his manuscripts, dated 1765.<sup>21</sup>

As I have shown in a previous article, Orv. f. 144, from which Vossius transcribed his text, does not have anything to do with the previous content, since it belongs to another manuscript, Vat.gr. 1824 (= V), and it was erroneously bound at the end of Orv.<sup>22</sup> Thus, the last folio of the Bodleian manuscript, which contains the *'Ionic' Altar* and the *Axe* with scholia by Holobolus, is simply the continuation of folio 29 of the Vatican manuscript which contains the end of the scholia on the *Syrinx* by Peditasimus and the *'Doric' Altar* with scholia by Holobolus.<sup>23</sup> The two folios made up a *sylloge* of Greek pattern poems which formed part of the Triclinian edition of Theocritus, as is reflected in MS. R.<sup>24</sup> Vossius probably worked with this folio when it was still in the Vatican Library, where he spent some time collating manuscripts in 1642.<sup>25</sup> When Vossius worked

<sup>20</sup> On this manuscript see F. Madan et al., *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford 1897) IV 55, no. 16949, and G. Galán Vioque, "A Missing Vatican Manuscript Page at Oxford. Holobolus' Commentary on the *Ara ionica* and the *Securis*," *BZ* 102 (2009) 632.

<sup>21</sup> C. J. Strackhoven, *Catalogus librorum manuscriptorum et impressorum viri nobilissimi Joannis Dorville* (manuscript copy [Oxford, Bodl. Lib. D'Orville 302-3], ca. 1765) 97<sup>v</sup>. It is also attested in Thomas Gaisford, *Codices manuscriptorum, et impressi cum notis manuscriptis, olim D'Orvilliani qui in Bibliotheca Bodleiana apud Oxonienses adservantur* (Oxford 1806) 15.

<sup>22</sup> Galán Vioque, *BZ* 102 (2009) 627–638.

<sup>23</sup> The existence of folio 29 of V was first discovered by C. Gallavotti: *Theocritus quique feruntur Bucolici Graeci* (Rome 1946) 255, and "La silloge tricliniana di Teocrito e un codice parigino-laurenziano," *BollClass* 3 (1982) 17–22.

<sup>24</sup> See Gallavotti, *BollClass* 3 (1982) 17–22. On the Paris manuscript see Wilamowitz, *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* (Berlin 1906) 9; Omont, *RevPhil* 28 (1904) 189–197; F. Garin, "Demetrio Triclinio e gli scoli a Teocrito," *RivFil* 47 (1919) 76 n.1; N. G. Wilson, "Miscellanea Palaeographica," *GRBS* 22 (1981) 397; and D. Bianconi, *Tessalonica nell' età dei Paleologi. Le pratiche intellettuali nel riflesso della cultura scritta* (Paris 2005) 99 n.35.

<sup>25</sup> Blok, *Isaac Vossius* 143–154.

with it, it was not bound as it is today, as the binding comes from the years of the pontificate of Pius IX (1846–1878). Vossius probably found some loose pages that were later carelessly bound together.<sup>26</sup> The original content of this manuscript is nowadays divided between two codices, V and Vat.gr. 1825.<sup>27</sup> It may be reconstructed as Vat.gr. 1825 ff. 218–232<sup>v</sup> + V ff. 1–29<sup>v</sup>. It is a manuscript of 226 x 153 mm., dated in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, written by a single copyist, and with its own peculiar pagination: *a1*, *a2*, *a3*, *a4* ... until the note *h3* that is at the bottom of Orv. f. 144.<sup>28</sup> It came no doubt from Demetrius Triclinius' scriptorium or his circle, for his hand has been detected on f. 222 of Vat.gr. 1825, in a scholium on *Id.* 5.<sup>29</sup>

The *'Ionic' Altar* (*Anth.Pal.* 15.25) copied by Vossius from Orv. had previously been published by C. Salmasius in 1619 and was not to reappear until the *Analecta* of Brunck.<sup>30</sup> The scholia

<sup>26</sup> According to P. Canart, the carelessness of many Vatican codices in these years is a direct consequence of the sack of Rome in 1527: *Les Vaticani Graeci 1487–1962* (Vatican City 1979) 87.

<sup>27</sup> On the complex nature of this codex see Gallavotti, *BollClass* 3 (1982) 12–15; D. Bianconi, "Libri e mani. Sulla formazione di alcune miscellanee dell' età dei Paleologi," *S&T* 2 (2004) 343–344; Galán Vioque, *BZ* 102 (2009) 631.

<sup>28</sup> Galán Vioque, *BZ* 102 (2009) 631. For this kind of pagination, common in the 14<sup>th</sup> century, see E. M. Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford 1912) 54.

<sup>29</sup> It is also present in the fragments of Aeschylus in ff. 54, 55, 78, and 78<sup>v</sup> of V. See Wendel, *Überlieferung* 31; A. Turyn, *The Byzantine Manuscript Tradition of the Tragedies of Euripides* (Urbana 1957) 254 n.238; P. Canart, *Codices Vaticani Graeci: Codices 1745–1962 I* (Vatican City 1970) 244–245; O. L. Smith, *Studies in the Scholia on Aeschylus I The Recension of Demetrius Triclinius* (Leiden 1975) 22 n.49; Gallavotti, *BollClass* 3 (1982) 15; N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (London 1983) 252 n.1.

<sup>30</sup> C. Salmasius, *Duarum inscriptionum veterum Herodis Attici rhetoris et Regillae coniugis honori positarum explicatio. Eiusdem ad Dosiadae Aras, Simmiae Rhodii Ovum, Alas, Securim, Theocriti fistuam notae* (Paris 1619) 126, 127–140 (commentary); and R. F. P. Brunck, *Analecta veterum poetarum Graecorum I* (Strasbourg 1785) 412. Salmasius' edition of the *'Ionic' Altar* was reproduced and commented on by F. Licetus, *Encyclopaedia ad Aram mysticam Nonarii Terrigenae anonymi*

of Holobolus were still unpublished and would not appear in print until the incomplete edition by Wendel.<sup>31</sup>

Vossius transcribed the text of the Orv. manuscript but collated it with the above-mentioned manuscript P, a 10<sup>th</sup>-century codex copied by different hands,<sup>32</sup> which had come into the Vatican Library when Maximilian I gifted the Palatinate library of Heidelberg to Pope Gregory XV in 1623 in appreciation of his loyalty during the Thirty Years' War.<sup>33</sup>

Vossius had first come into contact with this text via Salmasius as early as 1637, when the relationship between the two scholars, who had met one year previously, became a close, academic one. Salmasius found this manuscript in Heidelberg around 1606 and noticed its importance but failed to produce a complete edition of the anthology of epigrams that it contains, many of them previously unknown. In fact, it contains the most valuable copy of the Anthology of epigrams elaborated by Constantinus Cephalas in the early 10<sup>th</sup> century, whose selection of epigrams was also the source of Maximus Planudes' celebrated Anthology, compiled in the 14<sup>th</sup>,<sup>34</sup> and first edited by Joannes Lascaris in 1494.<sup>35</sup> Although it contains fewer epi-

---

*vetustissimi* (Padua 1630) 8, and this book was later republished in T. Crenius, *Museum philologicum et historicum* (Leiden 1700) II.

<sup>31</sup> *BZ* 19 (1910) 335–337. They have recently been published by Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung* 131–134.

<sup>32</sup> See C. Preisendanz, *Anthologia Palatina: Codex Palatinus et Codex Parisinus phototypice editi* (Leiden 1911) LVII–CXLI; M. L. Agati, “Note paleografiche all' *Antologia Palatina*,” *BollClass* 5 (1984) 43–59; A. Cameron, *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes* (Oxford 1993) 97–120; J.-L. van Dielen, “Zur Herstellung des Codex Palat. gr. 23 / Paris. Suppl. gr. 384,” *BZ* 86/87 (1993/1994) 342–362.

<sup>33</sup> See Preisendanz, *Anthologia Palatina* VIII–IX. For a short summary of the history of this manuscript see A. Meschini, “La storia del testo,” in F. M. Pontani, *Antologia Palatina* (Forino 1978) I xxxi–lvi.

<sup>34</sup> See E. Mioni, “L' *Antologia Greca* da Massimo Planude a Marco Musuro,” in *Scritti in onore di Carlo Diano* (Bologna 1975) 263–309.

<sup>35</sup> *Anthologia epigrammatum Graecorum*, impressum Florentiae, per Laurentium Francisci de Alopa, 1494. See Cameron, *The Greek Anthology* 121–159;

grams than P, Planudes' Anthology, reedited several times, was in Salmasius and Vossius' age the only way to know most Greek epigrammatic literature, apart from the numerous apographs of P that circulated in manuscript form.<sup>36</sup>

Although the friendship between Salmasius and Vossius deteriorated as the years passed and ended up a somewhat stormy one, in its early stages Salmasius lent Vossius his own manuscript copies and even let him take them home with him so that he could collate them. There is evidence that he even allowed him to take his valuable apograph of the Palatine codex back home to Amsterdam for collation, if such manuscript ever existed.<sup>37</sup>

When noting down the readings of the Palatine manuscript in the margin of the text he had copied from Orv., Vossius called it B. This is the case, for example, at line 1, where he notes in the margin οὐ με λιβρὸς ἱρῶν B (the text reads οὐ μεμβρὸς ἱρῶν σν);<sup>38</sup> at line 14, where alongside the erroneous reading ἔκγονος, which he takes from Orv., he writes -νοις B; at line 16, where he notes in the margin δ' indicating that B adds it after τάων, as is the reading of P; and at line 21, where against the reading Ὑπητιδων, which he copies from Orv., Vossius notes *in margine* Ὑπητιαδῶν B, as in P, and adds, alongside λαβροτέρην and ἄδδην, λαροτέρην B and ἄδην B, which are readings of P.

---

M. Lauxtermann, "The Anthology of Cephalas," in M. Hinterberger and E. Schiffer (eds.), *Byzantinische Sprachkunst: Studien zur byzantinischen Literatur gewidmet Wolfram Hörandner* (Berlin/New York 2007) 194–208, and his "Janus Lascaris and the Greek Anthology," in S. de Beer et al. (eds.), *The Neo-Latin Epigram: A Learned and Witty Genre* (Leuven 2009) 39–65.

<sup>36</sup> See J. Hutton, *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the year 1800* (Ithaca 1935); *The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800* (Ithaca 1937); R. Aubreton, "La tradition de l'Anthologie Palatine du XVI<sup>e</sup> au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle. I. La tradition germano-néerlandaise," *RHT* 10 (1980) 1–53 and *RHT* 11 (1981) 1–46.

<sup>37</sup> Blok, *Isaac Vossius* 39 and 223, and R. Aubreton et al., *Anthologie grecque XI Livre XII* (Paris 1994) XXII.

<sup>38</sup> I follow the third edition of Gallavotti, *Theocritus* (Rome 1993).

After the *'Ionic' Altar* Vossius expands his *sylloge* of Greek pattern poems by transcribing texts of P. The similarities between the text of Vossius and the Palatine manuscript are such that it seems unlikely that he was using an apograph. Moreover, on this occasion he makes a direct and unequivocal reference to the Palatine manuscript by means of the abbreviation "Pal."<sup>39</sup>

Thus, immediately after the scholia of Holobolus on the *'Ionic' Altar* of Orv., Vossius transcribed directly from the Palatine manuscript a second version of scholia, on this occasion the so-called ancient ones, and the marginal glosses on the *'Ionic' Altar*, under the headings "Scholiastis alter" (scholia) and "ibidem in margine" (glosses), on ff. 11–13; the *'Doric' Altar* (*Anth.Pal.* 15.26) on f. 14, without scholia, as in P;<sup>40</sup> the *Egg* (15.27) and its scholia on ff. 15–16;<sup>41</sup> the *excerpta* from the *Wings* (15.24) with scholia on f. 17;<sup>42</sup> the *Axe* (15.22) and notes on the *Syrinx* (15.21) on f. 18;<sup>43</sup> and the first version of scholia on the

<sup>39</sup> Particularly significant are the notes on the *Syrinx* as he even transcribes the variants *supra lineam* which appear in P, such as πῆμα, with an α *supra* η, Σιμαχίδας with an η *supra* the first α.

<sup>40</sup> As in P it has title (Δοσιάδα βωμὸς [sic]) and *subscriptio* (Δοσιάδα βωμὸς Δωριέως, ὃν ἔστασε Μούσαις ἐν γῶ), and the arrangement of the lines follows the scheme of P (cf. Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung* 66).

<sup>41</sup> It presents the same arrangement and line-distribution as P and even copies the line-numbering in the left-hand margin as it appears in P (cf. Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung* 67) as well as the same title (Βησαντίνου Ῥοδίου Ἰὼν χελιδόνος) and almost the same ending (Βησαντίνου Ἰ Ῥοδίου Ἰ Ἰὼν Ἰ [ἦ om. Voss.] Δοσιάδα Ἰ [ἦ om. Voss.] Σιμμίου Ἰ ἀμφοτέροι Ἰ Ῥόδιοι).

<sup>42</sup> Vossius does not copy schol. 342.6–11 W. (τοῦτου ἡ ἀνάγνωσις ... ἀφίκη). I cite the scholia in accordance with the edition of C. Wendel, *Scholia in Theocritum vetera* (Stuttgart 1966: hereafter Σ).

<sup>43</sup> It presents the line-arrangement typical of P and its apographs, even reproducing the line-numbering in the left-hand margin (cf. Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung* 65). The notes are a selection of variants as read in P, such as ἔχε τὰς ἀνεμώκεος (line 6 ἀνεμώδεος), ὃς Μοῦσα λιγὸν (7 ὃς Μοῖσα λιγὸν) and παπποφόνου τυρίαστε (10 παπποφόνου Τυρίας τ') (Vossius points out that to these should be added ἀφείλετο, the reading of the manuscripts as

*Syrinx* on ff. 19–21.<sup>44</sup>

Coincident readings over the two manuscripts are constant. Thus, in the text of the *Doric Altar* on f. 14, at line 2 there is the reading πόσις, as in P, as against the πόσσις of the bucolic manuscripts; line 5 reads χρυσὰς and ἐψάνδρα, as in P, as against the reading of the codices with scholia by Holobolus (χρυσουδς and εὔσ' ἄνδρα); the text of the *Egg* (f. 15) coincides verbatim with P, as do its scholia (ff. 15–16);<sup>45</sup> the scholia of the *Wings* (f. 17) read ἀφαιρ-, as in P, as against the ὑφαιρ- of the other codices (Σ 341.14), contain paragraph b on 342.1–5, exclusive to P, and have the reading Ἡσίοδος as in P (343.1); in the *Axe* (f. 18), at line 2 there is the reading ὄπασεν, as in P (ὄπασ' Κ ὄπασε δ' F Y), and at line 6 ἰθαράν, coinciding with P<sup>1</sup> (κα *supra lineam*, the reading of the other codices); and in the first version of the scholia on the *Syrinx* (ff. 19–21) the Palatine manuscript is followed for Σ 337.8 ἀνατίθησι ... ταύτην, 10 ἢ Π. ἐγ. Πᾶνα τὸν αἰπ., and 12 ἐπεὶ ... ἐκάλεσεν, 338.5 κέρας ... θρίξ, 19 εἶπεν ... ἀντιφθέγγεσθαι, 21 λαμβάνει, 339.11 συν-εμάχησε, as well as in the omission of 337.13–16 τὸν δὲ ... Ὀδυσσέως, and 339.7–8.

All the scholia transcribed by Vossius from the Palatine codex were unpublished. As for the *technopaegnia*, he probably did not copy the *Syrinx*, limiting himself to noting the readings

---

transmitted by the scholia of Holobolus and the earliest printed editions). They have the heading “In fistula scriptus in Pal.” Many are accompanied by the note “ita Pal.”

<sup>44</sup> These were published by Th. Bergk, “Scholia in carmina figurata,” *Kleine philologische Schriften* (Halle 1886) 760–763.

<sup>45</sup> Wendel was wrong in concluding that the presence of the *Egg* indicated that Vossius had used as an autograph the MS. B 75, since the text, including the title under which it was headed Milan Ambros.gr. (Βησαντίνου Ῥοδίου ὠϊὸν χελιδόνος) coincides with P: Wendel, *BZ* 16 (1907) 460 n.1. In the scholia on the *Egg*, for Σ 345.12 P reads τοῦ μέτρου, exactly as transcribed by Vossius, not τὰ μέτρα (Wendel), and for 345.17 μέτρου instead of μέτρα. There are a few mistakes in Vossius' transcription: Σ 345.18 φησιν P: φησι Voss., 346.1 φέρων om. Voss., 346.9 τὰ λοιπὰ ζητεῖ P: ταλιπονξτ Voss.

peculiar to P (f. 18), as the text was well known. It had already appeared in the editio princeps of Theocritus in 1495 and was systematically reproduced in all the editions.<sup>46</sup> The *Wings* and the *Axe*, along with the *Syrinx*, were also published in the Iuntine edition of 1515<sup>47</sup> and all of them plus the 'Doric' *Altar* were included by Kallierges in his edition 1516, and the text was also reproduced in subsequent editions.<sup>48</sup> Finally, the editio princeps of the *Egg* dates back to the edition of H. Stephanus in 1566.<sup>49</sup>

Vossius goes on to copy another version of scholia on the *Syrinx* on ff. 21–23,<sup>50</sup> from a now-lost manuscript that belonged to Pietro Vettori (1499–1585), as he himself states when he introduces the scholia with the title "In codice Victorii ita haec

<sup>46</sup> Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Venice 1595) ΘG (IV<sup>v</sup>), Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Paris 1511) Π<sup>v</sup>, Ζ. Θεοκρίτου Βουκολικά (Florence 1515) iVIII, Ζ. Kallierges, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Rome 1516) ιVIII<sup>v</sup>, J. Camerarius, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Hagenau 1539) I 6<sup>v</sup>, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Louvain 1528) QIII<sup>v</sup>–QIV, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Leipzig 1596) 129.

<sup>47</sup> Θεοκρίτου Βουκολικά (Florence 1515) i VIII<sup>v</sup> (*Wings*), κ II (*Axe*).

<sup>48</sup> Kallierges, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια μ III<sup>v</sup>. Reproduced in J. Camerarius, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια M 3<sup>v</sup>, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Basel 1530) 182, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Basel 1541) 163, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Venice, ex officina Farrea 1543) 78<sup>v</sup>, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Paris 1543) 142, Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια (Frankfurt, ex officina Petri Brubachij 1545) 85 (and in its reeditions of 1553 and 1558).

<sup>49</sup> H. Stephanus, *Οἱ τῆς ἡρωικῆς ποιήσεως πρωτεύοντες ποιηταὶ καὶ ἄλλοι τινές* ([Paris] 1566) 284. It was republished with different layouts and Latin translation in its edition of [Geneva] 1579 (*Theocriti aliorumque poetarum Idyllia* 386) and was included by D. Heinsius in his editions of [Heidelberg] 1603 (*Emendationes et notae in Theocriti Idyllia Bucolica* 307) and [Heidelberg] 1604 (*Θεοκρίτου, Μόσχου, Σιμμίου τὰ εὐρισκόμενα* 207). A copy of the *Egg* by Stephanus is preserved in the MS. Leiden Vossius misc. I, f. 1 (saec. XVI), but it is doubtful that it was the property of Vossius himself. Valckenaer made an apograph (Leiden 359, f. 28<sup>v</sup>). Cf. [P. C. Molhuysen], *Codices manuscripti III Codices Bibliothecae publicae Latini* (Leyden 1912) 114; Wendel, *Überlieferung* 179; de Meyier, *Codices manuscripti* VI 224.

<sup>50</sup> Whenever P presents a different reading from U, E, and M, Vossius reflects the reading of these other MSS.

concipiuntur scholia” (f. 21). On his death, this humanist’s library, with the exception of the oldest manuscripts of Greek and Latin authors, which he presented directly to Cosimo de Medici, passed into the hands of his family, who moved it in the 17<sup>th</sup> century from Florence to Rome, where it was probably consulted by Vossius. There, in 1780, the library was bought at auction by the Prince-Elector Karl Theodor, who deposited it in Mannheim. Then, around 1783, it was handed over to the Hofbibliothek of Munich. Among the manuscripts belonging to this humanist that are preserved today in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek there are none containing these scholia.<sup>51</sup>

This was another still unpublished version of the ancient scholia on the *Syrinx*, largely identical to that transcribed from the Palatine codex on ff. 19–21. On this occasion Vossius’ text is in line with the Vatican family of manuscripts of Theocritus, Vat.gr. 1825 (= U), 42 (= E), and 915 (= M), with more coincidences with E and M, with which it shares exclusive readings.<sup>52</sup>

<sup>51</sup> It is not mentioned in the catalogue by Franz Vettori, published by I. C. F. von Aretin, *Beiträge zur Geschichte und Literatur* (Munich 1803) I 75–96 (Greek MSS. at 76–79). For the history of his library see F. Tinnefeld, “Zur Geschichte der Sammlung griechischer Handschriften in der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München,” in M. Restle (ed.), *Festschrift für Klaus Wesel* (Munich 1988) 316–318; R. Mouren, “L’identification d’écritures grecques dans un fonds humaniste: L’exemple de la bibliothèque de Pietro Vettori,” in G. Prato (ed.), *I manoscritti greci tra riflessione e dibattito* (Florence 2000) I 433; K. Haidú, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek München X.1* (Wiesbaden 2002) 81–88.

<sup>52</sup> When E and M do not coincide with U, Vossius always follows the readings of E, as is the case, for example, at Σ 338.17 and 19. For the manuscripts of Victorius in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek see J. Hardt, *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum graecorum bibliothecae regiae Bavaricae* (Munich 1806) III 517, identifying 23 MSS. from the library of Vettori. Haidú (*Katalog* 86) adds two more (233 and 238). It may be that E and Vettori’s lost codex were one and the same. There are manuscripts of Vettori with scarcely any indication of ownership, such as Munich Bay.gr. 233. Some have only a *V* in brown ink on the first folio. Curiously, the first folios of E were lost and replaced by a different hand which is usually dated to the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Be that as it may, there are different readings between E and Vossius’ codex

There are very few differences with respect to these witnesses, but a few of them deserve to be highlighted: Σ 337.4 (f. 21) presents the reading τετράμετρον ἀκατάληκτον (πεντάμετρον ἀκατάληκτον P E: δίμετρον καταληκτικόν U M) and transcribes *supra lineam* the reading of U and M; and in line 21 Vossius or his antigraph converts the goat Amaltheia into a woman, following the mythical tradition which makes Amaltheia a nymph, in presenting an exclusive γύναικος Ἀμαλθείας (f. 22) for the unanimous αἰγὸς Ἀμαλθείας of the rest of the codices.<sup>53</sup>

Finally, he finished his *sylloge* by turning to two codices held in the Ambrosian library, Ambros. A 155 sup (52) (= Ambr.), a faithful apograph of C 222 inf. (886) (= K),<sup>54</sup> and B 99 sup. (121) (= F). Both had belonged to Vincentius Pinelli and had come into the Ambrosian library in 1609.<sup>55</sup> Vossius arrived in

---

that seem to point to an intermediate manuscript or else to suggest that the two are copies of the same antigraph. Manuscript E came into the Vatican library between 1548 and 1555: R. Devreesse, *Le fonds grec de la bibliothèque Vaticane des origines à Paul V* (Vatican City 1965) 427.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. H. W. Stoll, "Amaltheia," in Roscher, *Lex.* 1 (1884) 262–266; Wernicke, *RE* 1 (1894) 1720–1723; A. B. Cook, *Zeus* I (Cambridge 1914) 501–502. αἰγὸς Ἀμαλθείης is attested in Call. *Ap.* 49 and Nonn. *Dion.* 27.298.

<sup>54</sup> See Wendel, *Überlieferung* 182–183. Wendel (180), de Meyier (*Codices manuscripti* VI 251), and myself (*BZ* 102 [2009] 636 n.42) conjectured Ambr. to be antigraph of Vossius' text, but Strodel (*Zur Überlieferung* 19, 86) already points to Ambr. as its antigraph. Although there is no conclusive proof, the lay-out of Vossius' *Axe* is no doubt closer to Ambr. than to K, since there, as in Vossius' manuscript, the *Axe* is depicted vertically, not horizontally (photographs in L. A. Guichard, "Simmius' Pattern Poems: The Margins of the Canon," in M. A. Harder et al. [eds.], *Beyond the Canon* [Leuven 2006] 101, 103). Besides, Vossius' manuscript, like Ambr. and other apographs of K, has at the end of the handle μολπής, while K only has μ.

<sup>55</sup> They were acquired at an auction in Naples in June 1608 by Cardinal Federicus Borromaeus: see Ambros. G 198 bis Inf. f. 255; A. Rivolta, *Catalogo dei codici Pinelliani dell' Ambrosiana* (Milan 1933); G. Tiraboschi, *Storia della letteratura italiana* VII.1 (Modena 1777) 194; P. Bosca, *De origine et statu Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* (Milan 1672) 35; A. Martini, D. Bassi, *Catalogus codi-*

Milan in April 1643, a few months after having been in Rome, and worked there for a time collating and copying manuscripts.<sup>56</sup> Although, according to his own testimony, there were very strict rules forbidding the copying of unpublished texts, he managed to get round the prohibition, as he himself admits in a letter addressed to his father on 10 June 1643:<sup>57</sup>

Multum tamen mihi obfuit, quod hic sit constitutio quaedam, non iam dico inhumana, sed etiam barbara, qua cavetur nequis aliquid ineditum ex hac bibliotheca possit describere. Iniquitas ista per totam ferme Italiam obtinet, nusquam tamen magis quam hic. Non destiti tamen omnibus modis permulcere custodem huius Bibliothecae Ambrosianae, hominem Helvetium, probum quidem mihi que amicissimum, sed admodum propositi sui tenacem nimiumque fidum iniustae istius constitutionis observatorem.

However, I found many obstacles due to a certain regulation that I consider to be not merely inhuman, but even barbaric, whereby it is prevented that anyone be able to copy any unpublished text of this library. This injustice obtains through almost the whole of Italy, but nowhere as severe as here. Still, I did not desist from charming the watchman of the Ambrosian library, a Swiss, certainly honest, most friendly to me, but very tenacious in his mission, and an excessively faithful observer of this unjust regulation.

On the one hand, from Ambr. ff. 213–214, a manuscript of 286 x 201 mm. dated at the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, he copied the *Wings* (f. 24), giving the heading “In codice ambrosiano ita concipiuntur πτέρυγες in quo Theocrito attribuatur,” and the

---

*cum Graecorum Bibliothecae Ambrosianae* (Milan 1906) x–xii, 53, 62–64, 130–131.

<sup>56</sup> Blok, *Isaac Vossius* 170–173. In MS. Leiden Voss. gr. O 11 there are preserved other copies made by Vossius in Milan: see de Meyier, *Codices manuscripti* VI 211–212; Blok 172 n.81.

<sup>57</sup> MS. Amsterdam UB J 91 j (cited in Blok, *Isaac Vossius* 171 n.77). This letter is included in F. F. Blok, *Seventy-seven Neo-Latin Letters* (Groningen 1985) 233–235, no. 75.

*Axe* on f. 25.<sup>58</sup> The copy coincides in all the particular readings and also presents in the *Axe* a very similar lay-out of the lines.<sup>59</sup> Vossius must have been using a printed edition to collate the text because he underlines the differences between the manuscript and the printed editions of the time.<sup>60</sup> As for the text of the *Axe*, he was probably using the Iuntine edition of 1515 (f. k ii), since the lay-out is identical.<sup>61</sup>

The scholia found by Vossius in this codex are the ancient ones, albeit the version transmitted by the bucolic manuscripts. They had already appeared in print in the edition by Kallierges and subsequently been reprinted, although the scholia for the *Axe* were always incomplete, since in the printed editions of the time they stop at Σ 344.11 (χάριν ἀπό τινος ἔθηκεν).<sup>62</sup> Vossius does not transcribe them word for word but notes only the differences he finds between the Ambrosian manuscript and

<sup>58</sup> For a full description of this manuscript see E. Martini-D. Bassi, *Catalogus* I 62–64.

<sup>59</sup> See Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung* 68, 89, photograph on 360. As with K and its apographs, Vossius transcribes on the handle of the *Axe* the phrase τὰς βίνων κλυτὸς ἴσα θεοῖς ὡς εὔρε Ῥόδου γεγαῶς ὁ πολύτροπα μούνος μέτρα μολπῆς (μ K: μολπῆς apographs).

<sup>60</sup> For the editions of the *Axe* available to him, see above.

<sup>61</sup> The direction of the lines and the lay-out is the same (in Kallierges' edition the phrases on the left go in a different direction, as they do also in F. Licetus, *Ad Epei Securim encyclopaedia* [Bologna 1637] 6). It is not a copy of a printed edition because at line 11 reads ὄλβος, not τὸν ὄλβος as in the Iuntine and Kallierges editions and the manuscripts based on either of them (Vossius underlined ὄ, pointing out a difference in his apograph), such as Athos Μονὴ Καρακάλλου 241 f. 74<sup>v</sup>, which is based in Kallierges' edition (photograph in Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung* 362, Abb. 13) or Salamanca BU 295 f. 120<sup>v</sup>, itself an apograph of the Iuntine (see T. Martínez Manzano, "Hacia la identificación de la biblioteca y la mano de Demetrio Ducas," *BZ* 102 [2009] 723 n.27 and Taf. XV).

<sup>62</sup> Thus in Kallierges, *Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια* μ, and *Θεοκρίτου εἰδύλλια* (Venice 1543) 76. The final part of the scholia would not be published until the editions of the *Anthology* by Brunck, "Lectiones et emendationes in volumen I," in *Analecta* III 41, and F. Jacobs, *Animadversiones in epigrammata Anthologiae Graecae* (Leipzig 1798) I.2 19.

the edition he is working from, supplying the headings “Scholiastis sequitur qui in his differt” in the case of the *Wings* (f. 24) and “Scholion in πέλεκυς ita variat” for the scholia of the *Axe* (ff. 24–25),<sup>63</sup> and in the case of the *Axe* he transcribes them in their entirety down to the end, starting precisely at Σ 344.11, where the scholia finish in the printed editions, thus providing himself with an exclusive and complete text and one that was largely unpublished.

On the other hand, he uses F, f. 10, a codex of 251 x 163 mm. dated in the 13<sup>th</sup> or 14<sup>th</sup> century, as the original for ff. 26–27 where, under the heading “in codice antiquissimo Scholion,”<sup>64</sup> he assembles the scholia of Holobolus on the *Axe* which were as yet unpublished,<sup>65</sup> and also for ff. 28–30, where he transcribes the ‘Doric’ *Altar* and the scholia of Holobolus, the latter under the heading “Scholion in aram τοῦ αὐτοῦ eiusdem nempe qui in πέλεκυν scripsit” (f. 29).<sup>66</sup> Holobolus’ scholia on

<sup>63</sup> Thus, for example, for Σ 342.8 he notes the reading τὸ, which is attested at least in the printed editions of Kallierges and the edition published by the printing-house of Farrea in 1543, as against the reading ἐπὶ τὸν ἔσχατον present in K and all the manuscripts (cf. Wendel *ad loc.*: “τὸν ἔσχατον codd., correxi”).

<sup>64</sup> The section containing the pattern poems is generally dated to the 14<sup>th</sup> century: cf. H. Schraeder, “Die ambrosianischen Odysseescholien,” *Hermes* 22 (1887) 337–370. For a full description see G. Muccio, “Studi sopra Salustio Filosofo,” *StIt* 3 (1895) 2–7; Martini-Bassi, *Catalogus* 130–131; Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung* 22 (photograph at 363). This source is identified by Wendel, *Überlieferung* 180 n.1; de Meyier, *Codices manuscripti* VI 251; and Ferreri, *Nea Rhome* 3 (2006) 318 and 336.

<sup>65</sup> They were first published by Bergk, *Kleine philologische Schriften* 766–767. Voss. coincides with this codex, for example, in its heading, which has been transmitted in this form only in F (Ἑρμηνεῖαι τοῦ Ὀλοβόλου ῥήτορος, κυροῦ Μαουήλ καὶ μεγάλου πρωτοσυγγέλου), in the omission of τὸ ἔχον τρεῖς ... μονόμ. ὑπερκατάληκτον (lines 7–9), τὸ δεύτερον ... ὑποκάτω (24–25), καὶ ἐξῆς (26), and καὶ βαθυπλότους (46), and in following its exclusive readings at 19, 20, 21, 30, 33, 34, 42, 54–55, 56, 56–57, and 58.

<sup>66</sup> This part of the manuscript was separated when Vossius’ heirs compiled the catalog of his legacy in 1690, since it appears as an independent manuscript (see Leiden 127 AF, f. 11, no. 107). Another hand noted M-2

the *'Doric' Altar* had been published in the Farrea edition (1543), ff. Oi–Oii<sup>v</sup>, and in the first edition by Stephanus (1566),<sup>67</sup> but F's version was one with a considerable number of different readings. L. C. Valckenaer (1715–1785) would later use this copy of Vossius for his edition of scholia of 1767.<sup>68</sup>

In the case of the scholia on the *Axe*, there is proof that Vossius again used Orv., as there are corrections *supra lineam* which coincide with the readings of this codex (line 40 τότε *in textu*, πότε *supra lineam*)<sup>69</sup> and even passages where he departs from F to follow Orv., for example, at line 40 ανέθηκεν *in textu*, although he writes *supra lineam* the reading of F, ἔθηκεν, and in the non-omission of τὴν τεκτονικὴν, εἰς Ὀμήρειον ἔβη κέλευθον, ἤγουν ἤρξατο γράφειν μετρικῶς (51–52).

Moreover, after transcribing the scholia from F, he immediately begins to copy the scholia on the *Axe* from what is today the last folio of Orv., f. 144<sup>v</sup>. They are headed: “In codice ad Pelekun haec annotantur” (f. 27). Vossius marks with suspen-

---

220, pointing to the other main part of the codex (see n.8 above). The text of the *'Doric' Altar* follows F to the letter, even to the point of not respecting the distribution of the words over the verses. As in F, the scholia are missing the introductory paragraph (Σ 346.14–20), the hexametrical epiphoneme Χριστὲ ἄνα, σατὰν ὃς κάββαλες, ἄδω σοι δόξαν, and the final paragraph (Σ 350.1–3). It coincides with F in all the exclusive readings of this codex, according to Wendel's apparatus (Σ 347.1–349.24): 3 ἄποικοι ... Θεσσαλοί om. F, 6 δις ... Αἰολικῶς om. F, ὁ χρυσοῦς om. F, 12 καὶ κοιμιζόμενος om. F. It even coincides in those passages where Ferreri claims that Vossius has the correct reading against the erroneous readings of F (Σ 348.12 and 349.15) and also in the interlinear gloss which Ferreri says is in Vossius' MS. but not in F (*ad* line 14): Ferreri, *Nea Rhome* 3 (2006) 338.

<sup>67</sup> The text of Stephanus' edition was later reproduced unaltered by F. Liceti, *Ad aram Lemniam Dosiadae Poetae vetustissimi et obscurissimi Encyclopaedia* (Paris 1635): see Wendel, *BZ* 19 (1910) 334; Ferreri, *Nea Rhome* 3 (2006) 318.

<sup>68</sup> *Diatrise in Euripidis perditorum dramatum reliquiis* (Leiden 1767) 130–136. Still preserved is the apograph he produced in Leiden containing the *'Doric' Altar*, *Wings*, *Axe*, and *Egg* with scholia, MS. Leiden 497. See [Molhuysen], *Codices manuscripti* III 132.

<sup>69</sup> I use Sbordone's edition, in *Miscellanea* II 174–175. See Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung* 146–147.

sion points those passages he fails to understand, which coincide exactly with lacunae in Orv. This second set of scholia also presents readings exclusive to the Oxford manuscript, such as ἰδὲ τὸν δεύτερον καὶ ἔστι for ἢ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν τὸ κῶλον, ἔστιν ὁ δεύτερος, and κῶλον—κῶλα γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα Ἡφαιστίων<sup>70</sup>—συνάπτεται for κῶλον συνάπτεται. Vossius stops copying after Ἡ δ' ἔννοια αὕτη,<sup>71</sup> probably because he realizes that these scholia coincide largely with those he has transcribed immediately above from manuscript F.

One may wonder how Vossius could have access there in Milan to a manuscript he has previously consulted in Rome. Perhaps he has taken notes, but since we already know that a page of this manuscript was going to find its way into the Bodleian Library through Jacques Philippe d'Orville's legacy, it is tempting to think that that page was already in Vossius' hands. We also know that d'Orville (1696–1751), who studied at the University of Leiden, came into contact with Vossius' library, since among the manuscripts in his legacy at the Oxford Bodleian are several that contain collations copied from manuscripts preserved in Vossius' library, such as, for instance, Bodl. D'Orville 270, which, according to the catalogue,<sup>72</sup> contains on ff. 30–33 a collation of the first three *Idylls* of Theocritus, the result of a comparison of the text transcribed in the MS. Leiden Vossius gr. Q 38, ff. 158–167<sup>v</sup>,<sup>73</sup> with an Oxford edition of the year 1676.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, D'Orville was known

<sup>70</sup> A reference to Heph. *De poem.* p. 62.17–63.3 Consbruch.

<sup>71</sup> Line 30 in the edition by Sbordone, in *Miscellanea* II 174–175; §1 in that of Strodel, *Zur Überlieferung* 146.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Madan et al., *A Summary Catalogue* IV 99, no. 17148. See also Gaisford, *Codices manuscripti* 69.

<sup>73</sup> This manuscript also contains the complete *Idyll* 4, transcribed immediately after *Idyll* 3 with no indication of the transition. Cf. de Meyier, *Codices manuscripti* VI 146–147.

<sup>74</sup> The edition is likely to be *Θεοκρίτου τοῦ Συρακουσίου τὰ εὕρισκόμενα σὺν τοῖς τῶν παλαιῶν σχολίοις* (Oxford 1676), edited by John Fell (1625–1686), bishop of Oxford.

among his contemporaries for his fondness for borrowing manuscripts from the libraries he visited and not returning them.<sup>75</sup>

In the case of the scholia on the *'Doric' Altar* it also seems that Vossius used two manuscripts.<sup>76</sup> One of the manuscripts he used was undoubtedly F. It is possible that the other was the above-mentioned folio 29 of V, since Vossius makes corrections in the margin that at least in one case may stem from V (Σ 347.13 δηλοί F Voss.: φησι Y V Voss. *in marg.*). More definitive is the exclusive coincidence of the two manuscripts at Σ 348.14: τὴν Κρήτην νῆσον V Voss.: τὴν νῆσον τὴν Κρήτην Y F.<sup>77</sup>

Therefore, if it is accepted that in the Leiden manuscript there are signs that Vossius was familiar with the *'Doric' Altar* and the scholia of Holobolus transcribed on f. 29<sup>v</sup> of MS. V, it is quite likely that Vossius found both pages still together and that this folio was detached from folio 144 of Orv. between his age and d'Orville's time.

The sources for Vossius' *sylloge* of Greek pattern poems are therefore as follows:

9–11	<i>'Ionic' Altar</i> with Holobolus' scholia	Orv.
11–13	Scholia on <i>'Ionic' Altar</i>	P
14	<i>'Doric' Altar</i>	P
15–16	<i>Egg</i> with scholia	P
17	fragments of <i>Wings</i> with scholia	P

<sup>75</sup> See P. Burmann, "De vita viri illustri Nicolai Heinsii comentarius," in *Nicolai Heinsii adversariorum libri IV* (Harlingen 1742) 9: "Eius [sc. Arusianus Messus' *Exempla elocutionum*] autem exemplar apographum describere aliquando mihi licuit beneficio ... Jac. Phil. D'Orvillii, qui et hunc thesaurum inter alia literaria peregrinationis Italicae spolia, quibus onustus in patriam rediit, adservat" ("I have been able to make a copy of this manuscript thanks to ... J. Ph. D'Orville, who owns this treasure among other literary spoils of his Italian tour"). It is today's MS. Oxford Bodl. D'Orville 29, ff. 1–3. See Madan et al., *A Summary Catalogue* IV 44; A. di Stefano, *Arusiani Messi Exempla elocutionum* (Hildesheim 2011) LXXIX–LXXXIX.

<sup>76</sup> In this sense, see Valckenaer, *Diatribae* 138 n.3, 131 n.7, where he indicates that Vossius was using at least two manuscripts.

<sup>77</sup> Both the Farrea edition (1543) and that of H. Stephanus, *Poetae Graeci principes heroici carminis* (Paris 1566), omit this phrase.

18	<i>Axe</i>	P
18	notes on <i>Syrinx</i>	P
19–21	scholia on <i>Syrinx</i>	P
21–23	Second version of scholia on <i>Axe</i>	MS. Victorii
24	<i>Wings</i> with scholia	Ambr.
24–25	<i>Axe</i> with scholia	Ambr.
26–27	Holobolus' scholia on <i>Axe</i>	F [Orv]
27	Partial version of Holobolus' scholia on <i>Axe</i>	Orv.
28–30	'Doric' <i>Altar</i> with Holobolus' scholia	F [V?]

Vossius succeeded in bringing together an important corpus of unpublished scholia on the Greek pattern poems. One might reasonably wonder about the origin and purpose of such a selection of texts. It is likely that while he was in the Vatican library collating and copying unpublished texts he came across the Orv. folio, which would then have been attached to V, and discovered some scholia on the 'Ionic' *Altar*, with metrical notes and interlinear glosses different from those used and partially published by Salmasius in 1619, which presumably prompted him to copy them and turn to the Palatine manuscript in order to annotate the text he had copied from Orv. and transcribe other texts of interest. From this codex he would have copied only those texts that were of interest to him, especially the unpublished ones. In Rome he might also have located the manuscript of Petrus Victorius from which he copied the second set of scholia on the *Syrinx*. Later in Milan, he would have completed his *sylloge* with new texts and unpublished scholia.

As for the purpose of the collection, we have one printed testimony, in which he makes clear that he was familiar with these texts, since he fell back on them, and specifically on the scholia of Holobolus on the both *Altars* which he copied first from Orv. and F, to harshly censure C. Salmasius after his death,<sup>78</sup> in his *Observationes ad Pomponium Melam* of 1658, in a passage in which he questions his interpretation and takes the

<sup>78</sup> He died on 3 September 1653 (Blok, *Isaac Vossius* 449).

opportunity to criticize him as follows:<sup>79</sup>

Miror hoc non vidisse viros magnos, qui frustra in poëmatiis istis exponendis laborarunt.<sup>80</sup> Ultimus qui manum admovit est Salmasius, qui omnia ista Dosiadae poëmatia, una cum inscriptione Herodis Attici, cum proluxa expositione in lucem dedit.<sup>81</sup> Sed profecto in omnibus istis explicationibus nihil omnino est, quod alicuius sit momenti, quod non hausereit ex Scholiis Holoboli Rhetoris, quem totum descripsit, nulla tamen ullibi facta eius mentione.

I am surprised that this has not been seen by important men who uselessly strained in explaining these poems [*Doric* and *Tonic* *Altars*]. The last who did is Salmasius, who edited all these poems of Dosiadas together with Herodes Atticus' inscription, with a prolix commentary. But in all these explanations there is by no means anything of profit that has not been extracted from the commentaries of Holobolus, whom he copied to the letter yet without mentioning him anywhere.

Vossius goes on:

Geminum istorum scholiorum nactus sum exemplar, alterum Sylburgii, alterum Commelini manu descriptum. Sed & tertium communicavit Lucas Langermannus Hamburgensis, iuvenis imprimis eruditus, & de nobis optime meritus, depromptum ex eodem illo codice quo usus est Salmasius, quo & Anthologia Graecorum epigrammatum continebatur. Verum nihil ipsi hic profuit Holobolus, quoniam eum non intellexit.

I have found two copies of these scholia, one transcribed by Sylburg, the other by Commelinus. But Lucas Langermannus of Hamburg, a young scholar very erudite and much appreciated by me, also informed me that there exists a third codex copied

<sup>79</sup> I. Vossius, *Observationes ad Pomponium Melam de situ orbis. Ipse Mela longe quam antehac emendatior praemittitur* (The Hague 1658) 213–214.

<sup>80</sup> He thinks of Salmasius, as he says later, but probably also of F. Licetus, who published commentaries on these poems, his *Encyclopaedia ad Aram mysticam Nonarii Terrigenae anonymi vetustissimi* (Padua 1630) and *Ad Aram Lemniam Dosiadae poetae vetustissimi & obscurissimi encyclopaedia* (Paris 1635).

<sup>81</sup> I.e., Salmasius' *Duarum inscriptionum*.

from the same manuscript that was used by Salmasius, which also contains the Anthology of Greek epigrams. But Holobolus was completely useless for him, because he did not understand him.

His anxiety about censorship makes him careless, since it is easy to identify the antigraph of the last of the codices mentioned, the one transcribed by Lucas Langermannus, who precisely went to the Vatican library following Vossius's indications, with P, which does not contain Holobolos' glosses, but the ancient scholia. In addition, the one assigned to F. Sylburg (1536–1596) can be identified with Leiden Vossius gr. O 8, since it used to be considered an apograph made by the same Sylburg before the arrival of Salmasius to Heidelberg, or at least so it was believed in Vossius' age.<sup>82</sup> If this is true, this is one of the first mentions of the connection of this manuscript with Sylburg.<sup>83</sup> It is an apograph of P with a significant selection of epigrams. The pattern poems are on ff. 97–107 (*Egg*, *'Ionic' Altar*, *Axe*, and *Wings*, all with the ancient scholia except *Wings*, which has no scholia at all).<sup>84</sup>

Having edited the text, commented on it,<sup>85</sup> and translated it

<sup>82</sup> See Senguerdus et al., *Catalogus librorum* 399, no. 8, and Aubreton, *RHT* 10 (1980) 5–7.

<sup>83</sup> This relation is mentioned in Berlin SBB Spanhemianus 44, f. 100, an apograph of this codex copied by F. Spanheim between 1654 and 1670 (see Aubreton, *RHT* 10 [1980] 10 n.2), and in Colomesius' catalogue (Bernard, *Catalogi librorum* II.1 61, no. 2273, 162 = Colomesius, *Opera* 860, no. 162), and in the catalogue by Vossius' heirs made in 1690 (Leiden 127 AF, f. 16 [in the 1690 catalogue it has the signature CLIX, 162]). It is not mentioned in the 1716 catalogue (n.9 above: p.399 n.8, "Anthologia, h. e. epigrammata collecta ex variis Poetis, nunquam edita, quorum primum est Stratonis"). See Hutton, *The Greek Anthology* 8, 252–254, and, *contra*, Aubreton 6 n.3.

<sup>84</sup> Cf. de Meyier, *Codices manuscripti* VI 208–209.

<sup>85</sup> In the commentary Vossius writes "In ipso codice erat εἶμι ἄρσενος," which has recently led him to the apparatus criticus of Gallavotti's edition. Vossius goes on to say: "Unde faciebat Salmasius Ἡμάρσενος. Sed qui virile in Medea? An quod venefica fuerit? Nos rectius εἰμάρσενος."

into Latin, he states:<sup>86</sup>

Hic est verus sensus antiquissimi huius epigrammatii, a quo mirum quantum abiit Salmasius, cuius si interpretationem sequare, iam nec sensum efficies, plurimum vero peccabis in leges Grammaticae.

This is the real meaning of this old epigram [*Doric' Altar*], from which it is strange that Salmasius departed so much that if you follow his interpretation, not only you will not understand it, but you will even go against the laws of grammar.

Finally, the criticism of Salmasius culminates in these words:

Sed sane quaecunque vir iste ad hanc aram annotavit, talia sunt, ut confutatione non egeant. Ne in caeteris quidem Dosiadae poëmatiis explicandis multo fuit felicior. Quamvis enim Holoboli Rhetoris Scholia ubique ad verbum descripserit, eius tamen mentem non adsecutus est ubique.

But the things that this man annotated on this Altar [*Doric' Altar*] are such that there is no need of discussion. Nor while explaining other poems of Dosiadas was he luckier either. So, although he has copied literally Holobolus' glosses, he has not understood his meaning.

Years later Vossius received support from R. F. P. Brunck in this philological dispute, in spite of the admiration felt for Salmasius by Brunck,<sup>87</sup> although he specifies that Salmasius did not have access to Holobolus' scholia, thus refuting Vossius' censures:<sup>88</sup>

Ab huius tenebricosi poëmatii sensu longe aberravit Salmasius, quem hic destituit felix ingenium, quo in caeteris explicandis excelluerat. Caligini lucem admovit Is. Vossius ad Pomponii

<sup>86</sup> *Observationes in Pomponium Melam* 215–216.

<sup>87</sup> Brunck, *Analecta* I vii: “suae aetatis eruditorum principem, cuique parem vix sequentes tulere, Claudium de Saumaise” (“Claudius Salmasius, prince of the scholars of his age, and to whom those who came after have scarcely found the like”).

<sup>88</sup> Brunck, “Lectiones,” in *Analecta* III 95. He refers to Valckenaer, *Diatriba* 130–136.

Melae L. II. c. 7. p. 213. subsidio adjutus veterum scholiorum, quibus Salmasium caruisse manifestum est. His quod nunc utemur, publice gratiae agenda sunt Cl. Valckenario, qui ea erudito commentario illustrata nuper vulgavit Diatribes Euripideae cap. XII.

From the meaning of this dark poem [*Doric' Altar*] Salmasius moved further away, who lost that fortunate talent he had while interpreting others. Isaac Vossius cast light on the darkness in his note to the second book of Pomponius Mela, c. 7, p. 213, with the help of a few old glosses, which it is clear Salmasius lacked. We can use them now thanks to Cl. Valckenaer who published them accompanied by an erudite comment in his Euripidean Diatribe ch. XII.

In conclusion, Voss. is a very complete *sylloge* of Greek pattern poems with glosses, most of them then unpublished, which illustrates the working methods of a humanist of the 17<sup>th</sup> century who, like the majority of his contemporaries, dedicated a great part of his life to visiting libraries and copying and acquiring manuscripts. In addition, this codex appears to be a new witness to the enmity between Vossius and his former master Salmasius.<sup>89</sup>

*January, 2012*

Universidad de Huelva  
Departamento de Filologías Integradas  
Avda. Tres de marzo, s/n  
Huelva 21071, Spain  
vioque@uhu.es

<sup>89</sup> This article forms part of the Research Projects FFI 2008-00940 and P09-HUM-4534, and has been partly financed by FEDER. I would like to thank the anonymous referees for their suggestions and Mr. J. J. Zoltowski for the English translation.