

THE *STATIUS* OF GRONOVIVS (AMSTERDAM 1653) AND THE MANUSCRIPTS LONDON BL ROYAL 15.C.X AND 15.A.XXI¹

The edition of Statius which Johannes Fredericus Gronovius (1611–1671) published in Amsterdam in 1653² is acknowledged as the most significant stage in the evolution of the printed text of the *Thebaid* before the late nineteenth century.³ J.B. Hall rightly stresses that, in spite of some blemishes, it is the first edition of Statius' works which 'shows the application of much thought to the editorial process' and 'deserves to be called critical in the fullest sense'.⁴ In accordance with contemporary practice,⁵ Gronovius aimed, not at establishing Statius' text through a reconstruction of the manuscript tradition, but, rather, at selectively correcting a printed *textus receptus*. The prototype used for producing the text of his edition⁶ was the text of the edition of Amsterdam 1630 (a reproduction of that of Amsterdam 1624, itself derived from Gevartius' edition of Leiden 1616).⁷ Gronovius' text is not beyond reproach, even when

¹ I am deeply grateful to the Société Académique de Genève, who provided me with the funds that enabled me to examine the manuscripts of the British Library, and to the Scaliger Institute of Leiden University Library for granting me a Scaliger Fellowship which made it possible for me to carry out an in-depth study of Gronovius' documents. Thanks are also due to Cillian O'Hogan, Curator of Classical and Byzantine Studies at the British Library, for his generous and highly competent assistance with the manuscript Royal 15.C.X in the final stages of this article, and to Michael Dewar and Mark Heerink for inspiring exchanges. I would also like to express my sincere appreciation of the valuable criticism and suggestions received from CQ's anonymous reader.

² *P. Papinii Statii opera ex recensione et cum notis I. Frederici Gronovii* (Amsterdam, 1653).

³ See notably J.B. Hall in J.B. Hall, A.L. Ritchie and M.J. Edwards (edd.), *P. Papinius Statius: Thebaid and Achilleid* (Newcastle, 2007–8), 3.60–1, V. Berlincourt, "'In pondere non magno satis ponderosae...': Gronovius and the Printed Tradition of the *Thebaid*", in J.J.L. Smolenaars, H.-J. van Dam and R.R. Nauta (edd.), *The Poetry of Statius* (Leiden, 2008), 1–18, and V. Berlincourt, *Commenter la Thébaïde (16^e–19^e s.): Caspar von Barth et la tradition exégétique de Stace* (Leiden, 2013), 94 and 98.

⁴ Hall in Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3), 3.60.

⁵ See E.J. Kenney, *The Classical Text: Aspects of Editing in the Age of the Printed Book* (Berkeley, 1974), 18–20.

⁶ On the different kinds of prototypes used for the typographic composition of classical texts, and on the specific use of a corrected copy of a previous edition (the so-called *manuscrit belge*), see A. Severyns, *Texte et apparat: histoire critique d'une tradition imprimée* (Brussels, 1962), 19–20.

⁷ *Publii Papinii Statii opera omnia Ianus Casperius Gevartius recensuit et Papinianarum lectionum lib. V illustravit* (Leiden, 1616). *Pub. Papinius Statius denuo ac serio emendatus*

judged from the perspective of the *textus receptus*.⁸ The number of passages corrected remains indeed limited. It is, however, higher than in any other printed text between the first Aldine (Venice, 1502) and the edition of Müller (Leipzig, 1870). More importantly, Gronovius' corrections are usually of great value, and many of them promote readings that are still considered correct today. From the disappointingly short commentary ('gustus') in which Gronovius discussed a few problematic passages, it can be clearly seen that his corrections relied on solid information and good skills.⁹ Although Gronovius' knowledge of the textual transmission of Statius did not compare with Heinsius' knowledge of that of Ovid,¹⁰ his edition stands out, in the tradition of the *Thebaid*, for the numerous manuscripts it made use of: eleven (at least), as we learn from his commentary.¹¹

The identification of the sources used in Gronovius' edition finds little support in his text, both because, as has been said above, only a limited number of its readings differ from the edition that served as its model (Amsterdam 1630), and because most of those that do differ from it are readings widely attested in the manuscripts known to us. Far more support is offered by explicit elements in the commentary, such as the mentions of possessors' names or places of provenance, especially when they are associated with readings that are rare in the manuscripts known to us. Six or seven sources have been identified by Hall on the basis of such elements: Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek Gronovianus 70 (g), London BL Arundel 389 (U4), Madrid Biblioteca Nacional 10039 (H), Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek 312 (F2) and/or 6396 (F), Oxford Magdalen College lat. 18 (O), Paris Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 8051 (P).¹² These findings indicate that

(Amsterdam, 1624). *Pub. Papinius Statius denuo ac serio emendatus* (Amsterdam, 1630). The text of 1653, which is much closer to the texts of 1616, 1624 and 1630 than to any other, agrees with that of 1630 against those of 1616 and 1624 on readings such as 3.257 *flumine* (corrected to *flamine* in the *errata*) and 3.392 *animosque et pectora*, as observed in Berlincourt (n. 3 [2013]), 98; cf. Berlincourt (n. 3 [2008]), 11.

⁸ For a detailed and balanced assessment, see Berlincourt (n. 3 [2008]), 11–15.

⁹ Gronovius' notes are discussed by Hall in Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3), 3.60–1, Berlincourt (n. 3 [2008]), 9–11 and Berlincourt (n. 3 [2013]), 99–102 and *passim*.

¹⁰ See the systematic studies of M.D. Reeve, 'Heinsius's Manuscripts of Ovid', *RhM* 117 (1974), 133–66 and 'Heinsius's Manuscripts of Ovid: a Supplement', *RhM* 119 (1976), 65–78. As stated by Reeve (this note [1976]), at 76–7, Heinsius collated 286 manuscripts, and had at his disposal full collations of 10 other and *excerpta* from at least 26 more.

¹¹ *Ad Theb.* 11.191: '*Neges urnaque reponas*] In scriptis undecim reperi: *Alitibus fratrique tegas urnamque reportes*. [...]' The catalogue by H.J. Anderson, *The Manuscripts of Statius* (Arlington VA, 2009²), 1.1–487 (cf. 1.XXXI and the table at 2.2), lists 254 manuscripts of the *Thebaid*, the vast majority of which include the whole poem.

¹² See Hall in Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3), 3.61, 3.118, 3.122 and 3.131–2; cf. V. Berlincourt, *Textes et commentaires de la Thébaïde de Stace à l'ère de l'imprimerie:*

Gronovivs made use not only of numerous manuscripts, but also of good ones.¹³ He frequently referred to the value (and the antiquity) of his sources, and rated g highest.¹⁴

The identification of other sources on the sole basis of the commentary is hindered by two facts: manuscripts are mentioned in vague terms (for example 'a British manuscript' or simply 'a manuscript'), and few of the readings quoted are distinctive. The present article consequently takes a further step by comparing what Gronovivs says in the commentary with his hitherto unstudied documents, and in particular his collations, which are preserved in Leiden. It thereby extends our knowledge, not only of the sources that Gronovivs used in his edition of *Stativs*, but also of the procedures that he followed in preparing it.

LONDON BL ROYAL 15.C.X (R)

In his note on 10.171 [166]¹⁵ *consumptaue bracchia ferro*, Gronovivs quotes the reading *furor* from a British manuscript of which Patrick Young (1584–1652), the librarian of the Royal Library, had provided him a partial collation ('excerpta') transmitted by Johannes Adamus Schragivs (1616–1687):¹⁶

Britannicus codex, cujus excerpta Patricivs Iunivs V. CL. olim per Io. Adamum Schragivm, Argentoratensem IC. virum egregivm, ad me misit, pro *ferro* habet *furor*. [...]

The manuscript from which the collation read *furor* has not yet been identified, and this reading is not attested for any manuscript in Hall's edition.¹⁷

transmission et histoire culturelle (1470–1851) (doctoral thesis Neuchâtel, 2008), 486. For a codicological description of the manuscripts of *Stativs* mentioned in the present article, see Anderson (n. 11). The sigla used here and below are those of Hall, Ritchie and Edwards.

¹³ All the manuscripts listed in this paragraph have been used in some or all editions since Müller 1870, with the exception of U4, first used by Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3). H, O and P are among the primary manuscripts of Hall, Ritchie and Edwards.

¹⁴ On these points, see Berlincourt (n. 3 [2008]), 10 and Berlincourt (n. 3 [2013]), 246–7.

¹⁵ While Gronovivs' edition (contrary to previous editions) includes lines 10.100–5, the line count in his commentary ignores these lines. Further, the commentary erroneously refers to his line 165 as 166.

¹⁶ Quoted by Hall in Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3), 3.61.

¹⁷ Hall in Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3), 3.639 (secondary apparatus ad loc.) states that he has been unable to determine the source from which Gronovivs quoted the reading *furor*. Compare *furorque* reported in the edition of D.E. Hill, *P. Papini Stati*

The circumstances in which the collation was transmitted are revealed by a letter, Munich Universitätsbibliothek 2° Cod. Msc. 622, ff. 36r–37v, which Schragius sent from London to Gronovius in The Hague:

Fasciculo hoc quem vides inclusa mitto excerpta Codicis Thebaidos pervetusti, manu Cl. Junii perscripta [...]. Noluit Optimus Bibliothecarius ut laborem excerpta ista describendi suscipiam, sed ut vides ipse ex libro quodam, me multum interpellante, ex[s]cidit. Humanissimus profecto vir est et Tui amantissimus. Jussit me suo nomine tibi salutem plurimam dicere, et quamprimum excerpta ista submittere, ut si qua subsidio esse poterunt, per tempus aliquod frui possis, et editionem Thebaidos accelerare. Remissurum Te intra mensem stipulatus sum, interea temporis commodo Tuo satis, ni fallor, inservire poterunt.

The letter was sent on 24th December 1638, which means that Gronovius received the collation before he travelled to England and then to other European countries (April 1639–January 1642).¹⁸ The letter also makes it clear that the collation was written by Young himself.

The volume Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek Gronovianus 62¹⁹ contains various preparatory materials on Statius gathered by Gronovius, some of which were demonstrably used in his edition.²⁰ It preserves (part c, ff. 125r–133v) Gronovius' transcription of a partial collation ('excerpta') which, as stated in the *incipit* and in the *explicit*, was made in the Royal Library in 1609 against the text of the edition of Lyon 1598 (a reproduction of Bernartius' edition of Antwerp 1595), and provided to Gronovius by Young:

P. PAPINI STATI THEBAIS collata cum Ms in bibliotheca Regia Londini mens. Iul. CIOICIX [1609]. ad edit Bern. Lugduni ao. 98. (f. 125r)

FINIS EXCERPTORUM CODICIS MEMB. ANGLICANI: quae communicavit mecum Patritius Iunius. (f. 133v)

The collation, which quotes about ten readings per hundred lines, mentions a certain number of corrections and variant readings.

Among the three copies of the *Thebaid* contained in the old Royal Library catalogue, all of which are extant, the readings in Gronovius' transcription of the collation provided by Young match 15.C.X (R), the so-called *codex Roffensis* (tenth-eleventh century), but they match neither 15.A.XXI (U3) nor

Thebaidos libri XII (Leiden, 1983), not from a British manuscript, but from Leipzig Universitätsbibliothek Rep. I 12 (L).

¹⁸ On Gronovius' travels, see P. Dibon and F. Waquet, *Johannes Fredericus Gronovius, pèlerin de la République des Lettres: recherches sur le voyage savant au XVII^e siècle* (Geneva, 1984).

¹⁹ Codicological description in Anderson (n. 11), 1.165–6 No. 249.

²⁰ The relationship is particularly clear in part f, f. [23r], which contains a note on *Theb.* 1.10 very similar to that printed in the edition.

15.A.XXIX (U2).²¹ They also side with R against all the other manuscripts known to us, and, in particular, against the Worcester fragments (W) and the *codex Turonensis* (T), to which R is closely related.²² The collation agrees with R, for instance, on the following readings, which are attested elsewhere only rarely or not at all: 2.90 *illapsus* p.c. (*adlapsus* a.c.), 2.118 *f(o)edere* v.l., 2.191 *recedit* p.c. (*resedit* a.c.), 2.250 *expulsa* v.l., 2.451 *magna* (*regna* sscr.), 3.89 *in ensem* (*ictum* v.l.), 3.136 *igne* (*ungue* v.l.), 3.145 *animorum*, 3.158 *dolorem*, 3.211 *rubetis* (as opposed to *rubebitis*), 10.759 *exempto*, 10.769 *iuuit*, 10.801 *mutant*.²³ Readings that are distinctive of R against W and/or T include notably those just mentioned for 2.191, 2.451 and 10.801, as well as 2.344 *discedere* p.c. (*decedere* a.c.), 2.440 *longo*, 10.757 *angustior*, 10.897 *quierunt* v.l.²⁴ and 10.904 *conuertere* v.l. The numerous passages in which the collation reports both the reading before correction and the reading after correction that are present in R include (in addition to 2.90, 2.191 and 2.344 just mentioned): 8.613 *cunctatio* a.c. : *constantia* p.c., 8.614 *nutrit utramque* a.c. : *nutat utrimque* p.c., 9.541 *cuspidem* a.c. : *cassidem* p.c., 9.569 *prohibent* a.c. : *praebent* p.c., 9.616 *animumque* a.c. : *animoque* p.c., 11.158 *primumque* a.c. : *primamque* p.c., and 11.164 *uenerare* a.c. : *uereare* p.c. At line 10.171, the collation offers a thorough report of what is found in R: the reading *furor* in the text, and the correction *ferro* in the margin (by another hand).²⁵

Since we do not know of any other collation provided to Gronovius by Young, we can assume that the collation of R whose transcription is preserved in the volume Gronovianus 62 is the one which Schragius transmitted to Gronovius in 1638, and which Gronovius refers to in his edition, in the note on 10.171 quoted above, where he says that the striking

²¹ The development that follows improves on Berlincourt (n. 3 [2013]), 96–7, who proposes to identify R as the manuscript collated by Young with reference to four passages only, and neither establishes the relationship with the edition nor discusses the case of 10.171 which is crucial in this regard. Berlincourt (n. 3 [2008]), 2 tentatively identifies R as a source of the edition, but does not discuss Young's collation.

²² On the relationship between R, T and W (2.70–469 and 10.753–11.100), see R.D. Williams, 'The Worcester Fragments of Statius' *Thebaid*', *CR* 61 (1947), 88–90, R.D. Williams, 'Two Manuscripts of Statius' *Thebaid*', *CQ* 42 (1948), 105–12, and Hall in Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3), 3.152–6.

²³ 2.90 *illapsus*, 2.250 *expulsa*, 3.211 *rubetis* are reported by Müller 1870 but not by later editors; 2.118 *federe* is reported by Müller 1870 and Kohlmann 1884 but not by later editors; 3.158 *dolorem* is reported by Müller 1870 and later editors, but not by Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3).

²⁴ R also has (like T W) *quierant* v.l., not reported by Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3).

²⁵ Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek Gronovianus 62, f. 131v, *ad* 10.171 [166]: 'consumtaque brachia furor. sed hoc inducto marg. ferro.'

reading *furor* is found in the manuscript instead of the usual *ferro* (without saying that *ferro* is also found in the manuscript as a marginal correction). It is worth stressing that the collation was not made at Gronovius' request, but decades before it was transmitted to him. There is no evidence that Gronovius himself saw R when he visited England in 1639, and the fact that, in his note on 10.171, he only refers to the collation provided by Young, rather than to a personal collation, suggests that he did not. On this occasion at least, then, he did not show as much zeal as Heinsius, who himself collated manuscripts from which he already had *excerpta* at his disposal.²⁶

LONDON BL ROYAL 15.A.XXI (U3)

In his note on 8.226 *contraque in tempore certant*, Gronovius quotes the reading *in pectore* from three British manuscripts.²⁷

Reperi eandem lectionem [*scil. in pectore*] in Britannicarum membranarum unius contextu, duarum oris.

This note offers little information on the manuscripts concerned, since Gronovius does not say how he has had access to them and the reading he quotes from them is not rare. Nonetheless, the note is sufficiently informative to suggest that one (at least) of these three British manuscripts is different from those hitherto identified as sources of the edition: O and U4,²⁸ and R. Gronovius specifically says indeed that he reads *pectore* once in the text and twice as a variant, whereas in the identified British sources this reading features as a variant in U4 only, and in the text in O and in R (something that Gronovius could not even know if he did not himself see the manuscript).²⁹

Gronovius' copy of the edition of Statius from 1624³⁰ preserved in Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek 755 H 1 contains his collations, made in 1639, of three British manuscripts described on p. 327: one of Arundel and one 'of Patrick Young' (a problematic attribution as will be seen below), cited

²⁶ See Reeve (n. 10 [1976]), 77.

²⁷ Quoted by Hall in Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3), 3.61.

²⁸ Cf. introduction and n. 12.

²⁹ Young's collation of R discussed above does not quote the reading *pectore*, and this reading cannot be deduced from the edition against which the collation was made (Lyon, 1598), since *tempore*, not *pectore*, is printed in that edition.

³⁰ Cf. n. 7.

together in a first note, and one of Magdalen College, Oxford, cited in a second note.³¹

Contuli Thebaidem Statii cum duob. MSS. memb. for. 8° oblonga : altero Comitiss Arundellij, quondam B. Pirchaimeri, altero Patritii Iunii. Prior per A, alter per I designatus est. Absolvi Londini Non. Iun. Iul. A. ꝛ CIO IOC XXXIX [1639].

Contuli tertium membranaceum cod. ex bibliotheca Collegij Magdalenae Oxonij, forma in 4^{to} longiore quam latiore, plenum Glossis plerisque eruditis, eodem anno [1639]. Absolvi X Kal. Sextil. Iulian.

The collations, which quote about ten readings per hundred lines (like the collation of R provided by Young), mention some corrections and variant readings.

On the one hand, the manuscripts of Arundel and of Magdalen College collated in this volume are manuscripts whose use in Gronovius' edition has been identified on the basis, not of the collations, but of explicit elements in Gronovius' commentary: U4 and O.³² The readings designated with the sigla 'A' and 'M' respectively are indeed those of U4 and O.³³ On the other hand, the manuscript 'of Young' collated in the same volume, whose readings are designated by the siglum 'I', is not one of the manuscripts whose use in Gronovius' edition has been identified.

In the first book of the *Thebaid*, Gronovius reports two defects of the manuscript he assigns to Young, namely that it lacks lines 1.228–383 and 1.462–539. The initial and final lines of both passages are marked with square brackets; in addition, the lacunae are expressly indicated as such with the letter θ facing 1.228 and 1.462. Accordingly, the collation does not include any reading for those two passages.

Since Gronovius describes the manuscript as belonging to Young,³⁴ we might expect it to have followed the rest of Young's collection to the library of Trinity College, Cambridge. However, the defects just mentioned are not present in the only manuscript of the *Thebaid* now at Trinity College, O.9.12 (J5), which contains the lines in question. Alternative candidates for the identification of the source collated by Gronovius are the manuscripts which were at the Royal Library, where Young worked. The defects reported in

³¹ The manuscripts described in the first note are also mentioned in Gronovius' letter to Isaac Vossius, s.l. [London], 16 June (*VIII Eid. Jun. Jul.*) 1639, edited in Dibon and Waquet (n. 18), 57 No. 13: 'Duos tamen mss. Thebaidis statianae, arundellianum alterum, alterum Pat. Junii contuli.'

³² The manuscript of Arundel is quoted in the notes on lines 6.718, 9.551 and 10.142 [136], and that of Magdalen College in the note on line 4.528.

³³ U4: notably 1.214 *exatiabile*, 1.478 *mulcente* and *rege*, 1.518 *alteque*, 1.656 *figunt*. O: notably 1.49 *indignantem*, 1.255 *saeptisque*, 1.379 *magna*.

³⁴ 'Patritii Iunii' in the quotation above. Cf. 'Pat. Junii' in the letter quoted in n. 31.

Gronovius' collation are present neither in 15.A.XXIX (U2) nor in 15.C.X (R),³⁵ but they are present in 15.A.XXI (U3) (thirteenth century), which lacks 1.228–383 and 1.462–539 due to missing folia between ff. 5^v and 6^r and between ff. 6^v and 7^r.³⁶ Furthermore, the readings collated by Gronovius match U3, but match neither U2 nor R, and they also side with U3 against J5 and against all the other manuscripts known to us. Agreements with U3 include, for instance, the following readings, which are rarely or not attested elsewhere: 1.85 *desiliant*, 2.658 *timide queris* (where the collation accurately mentions the cancellation of *se-*), 3.415 *subiit curas*, 3.656 *Sidonias ... arces*, 4.712 *auertensque*, 7.712 *Clomium*, 10.305 *Parmenus*, 11.434 *et lernan et argos*.³⁷ The physical characteristics of U3 are also compatible with Gronovius' (admittedly vague) description of 'Young's manuscript', in particular with regard to its elongated shape similar to that of the Arundel manuscript.³⁸ The identification of U3 as the manuscript 'of Young' which Gronovius collated in 1639 shows that the folia now missing from U3 were already missing at that time. It remains unclear why Gronovius assigns it to Young, who does not seem to have owned it, rather than to the Royal Library.

The collations in the annotated volume preserved in Leiden all predate Gronovius' edition. Since the other manuscripts collated there, U4 and O, were used in the edition, we can assume that U3 was too. That this actually was the case is suggested, precisely, by the note on 8.226 quoted above. When Gronovius says that *pectore* is found in the text of a British manuscript and as a variant in two others, he most probably refers indeed to the three manuscripts collated in the volume discussed here. The collations accurately report the fact that *pectore* is present in the text in O, and as a variant reading in U4 and U3. The edition further appears to bear witness to the use of U3 with respect to much more striking readings. This manuscript must indeed be the source from which Gronovius, in his notes on 7.369 (*sic*) and 10.305 [300], quotes the readings 7.712 *Clomium* and 10.305 *Parmenus*, without saying where they are found. While these readings are not attested for any manuscript in Hall's edition, they are, as

³⁵ The identification of R as the manuscript 'of Young' mentioned in the letter quoted in n. 31, proposed in Berlincourt (n. 3 [2013]), 97, must therefore be discarded.

³⁶ These missing folia are not reported in Anderson (n. 11), 1.212 No. 319.

³⁷ This list results from my own inspection of the manuscript. The edition of Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3) does not report its readings at 1.85, 2.658, 3.415, 4.712, 7.712, 10.305, 11.434, a silence to be explained by the fact that U3 features among the secondary manuscripts, which are cited only selectively.

³⁸ The shape and dimensions of U3 are very similar to those of U4: 214 x 126 mm and 210 x 120 mm respectively: Anderson (n. 11), 1.212 No. 319 and 1.194 No. 295.

shown in the previous paragraph, both present in U3 and reported in the collation made by Gronovius.

CONCLUSION

This article formally identifies as sources of Gronovius' edition two manuscripts that were at the Royal Library: R, which his commentary refers to with explicit information, and U3, which his commentary refers to in vague terms. By this means, the number of known sources is raised to eight or nine out of a total of (at least) eleven.³⁹ More importantly, one of the strengths of the edition, namely that it was based on good manuscripts, is confirmed, in particular, by the identification of R as one of its sources.⁴⁰ Neither R nor U3 seems to have been used in previous editions.

In addition, this article breaks new ground in identifying two collations on which Gronovius relied, and in thereby allowing us to catch a glimpse of his editorial skills. In this regard, distinctions must be drawn, on the one hand, between Gronovius' own collation (of U3) and the collation he received (of R), and, on the other hand, between the collations themselves and what he made of them when preparing his edition.

The pains Gronovius took to transcribe the collation of R provided to him by Young suggests that he saw this manuscript as a valuable source, even though he apparently did not consult it himself during his subsequent stay in London. As for U3, which Gronovius himself collated, it can be observed that he reported as many readings from it (and from U4) as from O collated in the same volume.⁴¹

The identification of the intermediaries through which some readings of R and U3 (and of U4 and O) were transmitted to Gronovius' edition lets us see that he could rely on dense, detailed and thorough collations. In its turn, this finding helps us understand the circumstances under which Gronovius produced an edition of Statius that did not entirely measure up to his

³⁹ One may compare the case of the manuscripts of Ovid collated by Heinsius, at least 85% of which have been identified: see Reeve (n. 10 [1976]), 76–7.

⁴⁰ R has been used in almost all editions since Müller 1870 and is among the primary manuscripts of Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3); cf. introduction and n. 13. J. Boussard, 'Le classement des manuscrits de la *Thébaïde* de Stace', *REL* 30 (1952), 220–51 puts it in the broad group ψ of his class ω , like W and T (cf. n. 22), as well as, among others, b, F2, F3, g, L, K, M3, M4, S, S4, U5, U13, U20 and Z12 (Hall's sigla). U3 has first been used, as a secondary manuscript, by Hall, Ritchie and Edwards. Boussard (this note) puts it in the group χ of his class ω , like, among others, U8 and U9 (Hall's sigla).

⁴¹ O has been used by Garrod 1906 and Hill (n. 17) and is among the primary manuscripts of Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3).

abilities and to the value of his sources. It demonstrates that the main weakness of the text he published, namely the limited number of passages corrected, should be blamed less on the information he had at his disposal than on the use he made of it – a situation somewhat similar to that of the notes he published, which were less substantial than the commentary he had undertaken to compose in earlier years.⁴² With regard to the text just as with regard to the notes, the shortcomings of his edition are due at least in part to the haste, attested both in the book and in the correspondence, with which it was prepared.⁴³

University of Basel

VALERY BERLINCOURT

valery.berlincourt@unibas.ch

⁴² Gronovius' handwritten commentary is preserved in the volume Leiden Universiteitsbibliotheek Gronovianus 62 (cf. n. 19), part g, ff. 1r–10v, covering *Theb.* 1.1–102. Cf. Berlincourt (n. 3 [2013]), 97.

⁴³ On the hasty preparation of the edition, see Hall in Hall, Ritchie and Edwards (n. 3), 3.61, Berlincourt (n. 3 [2008]), 13–14 and Berlincourt (n. 3 [2013]), 97.