

sione degli argomenti, però, è la medesima delle *Responsiones* perché la conclusione della prima parte, dedicata all'antichità, si sofferma a lungo sulla difesa dell'abito bianco (pp. 131-154; libro I capp. 23-26).

Il *Difensorius* difende l'antichità dell'ordine e poi passa alla difesa dell'abito bianco, ma è privo dell'argomento basato sulla lista dei santi prodotti dall'ordine. A differenza delle due precedenti opere, però, l'argomentazione a favore dell'antichità dell'ordine dei canonici regolari ha una struttura particolare: si passano in rassegna gli altri ordini religiosi e si critica la loro vantata antichità (benedettini, minori, predicatori, crociferi, carmelitani, eremiti, ecc.). Vi è, inoltre, un elemento, già sopra ricordato, che consente di affermare che questo trattato è stato scritto dopo il *Venatorium*: in diverse occasioni l'autore dichiara di non approfondire l'argomento perché lo ha già trattato nel *Venatorium*; ad esempio, all'inizio del « de habitu » troviamo dieci righe uguali all'inizio del cap. 25 del I libro (p. 149). Il suo rapporto con le *Responsiones* è più difficile da stabilire: vi sono alcuni argomenti a favore dell'abito bianco che sono simili (ad esempio, il riferimento al cap. 28 del libro dell'Esodo); però le *Responsiones* contengono altri argomenti in comune col *Venatorium*, ma non col *Difensorius*.

La situazione, dunque, è complessa e si possono solo avanzare alcune ipotesi. Può darsi che le *Responsiones* per la loro forma sintetica rappresentino una tappa preparatoria al *Venatorium*, però potrebbero anche essere posteriori al *Difensorius*. Infatti, all'inizio delle *Responsiones* troviamo un indizio che suggerisce un'altra identificazione; tra le prime righe leggiamo così: « ideo sequuntur quaedam excerpta ex cuiusdam brevissima compilatione », dunque esisteva un'altra breve composizione dell'autore da cui proveniva del materiale e un candidato a questa identificazione potrebbe essere il *Difensorius*. E' però possibile che uno di questi due testi coincida col *Compendium Venatorii* citato da A. Sanderus⁽¹⁹⁾.

Claudio BALZARETTI

THE CODEX PHILLIPPICUS 4211 AND THE MANUSCRIPT TRADITION OF OPIAN OF APAMEA'S *CYNEGETICA*. (*)

Up to the present date, the only existing critical edition of the *Cynegetica* is that of Pierre Boudreaux, which was completed at the beginning of the century and published in Paris in 1908⁽¹⁾. Three years before its publication, the edition had already earned the renowned philologist the title of *élève diplômé de la section d'histoire et de philologie de l'École pratique des*

(19) *Bibliotheca Belgica manuscripta*, 1644 (rist. anast. Bruxelles 1972), tomo II, p. 56.

(*) I would like to express my thanks to Dr. J.L. Berbeira, of the Dept. of English of the University of Cádiz, without whose valuable collaboration the realization of this work would not have been possible; to Dr. J.G. Montes, of the Dept. of Classical Languages of the Univ. of Cádiz, for their guessed right observations; and finally to Ms. Rosario Marin, of the Biblioteca de Humanidades of the Univ. of Cádiz, for the arrangements she carried out in our favour.

(1) *Ὀπιανῶν Κυνηγετικά. Oppien d'Apamée. La Chasse. Édition critique par Pierre Boudreaux*, Paris, Champion éditeur, 1908 (= fasc. 172^b de la Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Etudes).

Hautes Études, and general critical acclaim. At that time, Boudreaux's work earned praise for the advances it achieved in its textual quality, his great merit lying in the presentation of a precise and methodical study rooted in the manuscript tradition of the poem, something almost all previous editions had failed to do. Many of these earlier works had done little more than correct the *editio princeps* (Venice, 1517), making use of few, and not precisely the best, of the extant manuscripts of the poem. Before Boudreaux, only O. Tüselmann had carried out a serious study of some of the manuscripts of the *Cynegetica*, (the four Florentine and the three Venetian), although he never actually edited the Greek text. He did however present a classification of these manuscripts, but since this work was based only on the collation of the variants of the first book, it reveals serious limitations ⁽²⁾.

Thus, the most complete *recensio* and *collatio* of the extant codices of the *Cynegetica* are still those carried out by Boudreaux for his edition. Boudreaux collated seventeen manuscripts, established the dependency relationship among them and formed the corresponding *stemma codicum*. Having determined that five of those codices (designated N, O, P, Q, R) were *descripti* clearly derived from other originals already in existence, he used the remaining twelve as the basis to constitute the text. The group of codices studied were the following (*sigla* given in brackets are those given by Boudreaux): *Venetus Marc. gr.* 479 (A); *Parisinus gr.* 2736 (B); *Parisinus gr.* 2860 (C); *Neapolitanus II F* 17 (D); *Laurentianus* 31.27 (E); *Parisinus Suppl. gr.* 109 (F); *Parisinus gr.* 2723 (G); *Venetus Marc. gr.* 468 (H); *Matritensis* BN 4558 (I); *Laurentianus* 32.16 (K); *Vindobonensis phil. gr.* 135 (L); *Laurentianus* 31.3 (M); *Venetus Marc. gr.* 480 (N); *Laurentianus* 86.21 (O); *Parisinus gr.* 2737 (P); *Salmanticensis* M 31 (olim 1-1-18) (Q); *Vaticanus gr.* 118 (R) ⁽³⁾.

However, these were not the only extant manuscripts of the poem. Boudreaux himself recognized the existence of another codex: « nous avons collationné tous les manuscrits conservés, sauf un » ⁽⁴⁾; and identified that unexamined codex as: « le ms. 4211 de la bibliothèque de Sir Thomas Phillipps, à Cheltenham, ms. du XV^e siècle » ⁽⁵⁾. Many years later, in 1981, Antonio Zumbo published the collation of the text of the *Cynegetica* transmitted by a codex in the Yale University Library which had belonged to Sir Thomas Phillipps ⁽⁶⁾: the codex *Yalensis* 255 (= *ex Phillipps* 6435) ⁽⁷⁾. This was a *codex chartaceus* of V + 137 ff. containing an anonymous *Vita Oppiani* and a *περὶ οὐχῆ* of the *Halieutica* by Oppian of Cilicia (ff. 1r-1v), followed by the poem itself (ff. 2r-61r, with scholia in the margins), a second anonymous *Vita* of Oppian (f. 61v) ⁽⁸⁾, followed by Oppian of Apamea's *Cynegetica* (ff. 61v-96v), without scholia and only some marginal glosses, *De raptu Helenae* by Coluthus (ff. 101r-

(2) See O. TUSELMANN, *Zur handschriftlichen Ueberlieferung von Oppians Kynegetika*, Programm, Ilfeld, 1890.

(3) In the *stemma codicum* Boudreaux also included the now lost *vetus codex*, extracts of which, having been communicated by F. Sylburg, appeared in the margins of the C. Rittershausen edition (Antwerp, 1597). Boudreaux designated this *vetus codex* « Σ », naming it *Sylburgi codex manuscriptus*.

(4) BOUDREAUX, p. 2.

(5) BOUDREAUX, p. 2, n. 2.

(6) *British bibliophile, 1792-1872*.

(7) A. ZUMBO, « Un nuovo manoscritto dei *Cynegetica* pseudo-oppianei », *BollClass* 2 (1981), pp. 95-103.

(8) This *Vita* corresponds to the one known as Oppian's *Vita β*. See A. WESTERMANN, *Biographoi. Vitarum scriptores graeci minores*, Brunsvigae, 1845 (repr. Amsterdam, 1964), pp. 65 s.

106r), *Ilii excidium* by Tryphiodorus (ff. 106r-115v), and the *Descriptio orbis* by Dionysius Periegeta (ff. 122r-137v) (9).

The *Yalensis* 255 had remained practically unknown until its inclusion, firstly in the *Supplement* of C.U. Faye and W.H. Bond (10), and then in the study of the manuscript tradition of the *Halieutica* by Oppian of Cilicia carried out by F. Fajen (11). E. Livrea was the first to use it in his collation of the text of Tryphiodorus (12), as his outstanding disciple A. Zumbo would later do with Oppian of Apamea's (13). In addition however, Zumbo determined, through close palaeographic study and examination of the watermarks on the manuscript, both its probable place of origin (Southern Italy, perhaps Terra d'Otranto) and its date (the late fifteenth century) (14). It only remained to determine the identity of the scribe of the *Yalensis* 255, thought possibly to have been the same copyist of the *Neapol. II F 17* (=D) (15).

The conclusion that the manuscript to which Boudreaux did not have access to and the *Yalensis* 255 are, in fact, one and the same is, as far as Zumbo is concerned, beyond doubt: « il codice *Yalensis* 255 (= *ex Phillipps* 6435) era già noto all'editore dei *Cynegetika* dello Ps. Oppiano, P. Boudreaux, il quale nel suo *Avant-propos* notava di aver collazionato per quel testo tutti i mss. conservati, eccetto uno, 'le ms. 4211 de la bibliothèque de Sir Thomas Phillipps, à Cheltenham, ms. du xv^e siècle' » (16). Elsewhere, in a tone of natural satisfaction, Zumbo states: « dopo un settantennio abbiamo l'opportunità di colmare questo vuoto, chè il ms. di cui il Boudreaux lamentava la mancata possibilità di collazione altro non sarebbe se non lo *Yalensis* 255 (*Y*= *ex Phillipps* 6435) » (17). Clearly, with the *collatio* of the *Yalensis* 255, Zumbo fills a gap in the manuscript tradition of the *Cynegetica*, and here the merit of the Italian scholar's contribution is undeniable. Less certain, however, is his assumption that the manuscript to which Boudreaux had no access and the *Yalensis* 255 were one and the same.

From the very beginning, it seemed to us that the loose ends had not been securely tied, and that there was a clear disagreement between Boudreaux and Zumbo over the original

(9) For a more complete description of this codex, see the works by A. ZUMBO, « Collazione dei mss. *y*² e *b* degli *Halieutika* di Oppiano », *BollClass* 1 (1980), (pp. 63-92) pp. 64-66, and the above cited (n. 7), pp. 95 s. For the part of the codex relevant to Tryphiodorus, see E. LIVREA, « Un nuovo codice di Trifiodoro », *Scritti in onore di S. Pugliatti*, V, Milan, 1978, (pp. 409-508) pp. 501 ss.

(10) *Supplement to the Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States and Canada*, originated by C.U. Faye, continued and edited by W.H. Bond, New York, 1962, p. 46.

(11) F. FAJEN, *Uebertieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Halieutika des Oppian*, Meisenheim am Glan, 1969, pp. 19 and 68 s. Nonetheless, Fajen did not undertake the collation of the text of the *Halieutica*.

(12) LIVREA (n. 9). The editions of *De raptu Helenae* by Livrea himself (Leipzig, 1982) and by B. GERLAUD (Paris, 1982) take this codex into account.

(13) In the above cited articles (n. 7 and 9).

(14) Cf. ZUMBO (n. 9), p. 64 and nn. 10-11, LIVREA (n. 9), p. 502, n. 4 and p. 508, ADDENDUM. Thus the Faye-Bond theory that the codex dates from the Fourteenth century and originated in « the Byzantine East » has been rejected. As far as the watermarks are concerned, they were Briquet 4061 (Venice 1494) and a variation of Briquet 3517 (this information was supplied to Zumbo *per litteras* by Christina M. Hanson, Ass. Research Librarian at Yale University Library).

(15) Cf. E. LIVREA, *Triphiodorus. Ilii excidium*, Leipzig, 1982, p. VIII. ZUMBO (n. 9), p. 66, n. 16 maintains the probability that the *scriptorium* of the *Yalensis* 255 and of the *Neapol. II F 17* (= D) was the monastery of S. Nicola di Casole. As to the date of the *Neapol. II F 17* (end of XV century, beginning of XVI) see ZUMBO (n. 9), p. 66 and n. 15.

(16) ZUMBO (n. 9), p. 64. Zumbo, just as we have done before, reproduces the words of BOUDREAUX (n. 1), p. 2, n. 2.

(17) ZUMBO (n. 7), p. 95.

number of the Phillipps codex. Whereas Boudreaux referred to the codex as « le ms. 4211 », Zumbo legitimately referred to it as « *ex Phillipps 6435* » in as much as in the f. Ib of the present-day *Yalensis* 255 it is stated « *annotato a matita 6435 Ph.* » (18). Such an annotation makes one suspect an error in the numbering given by Boudreaux, and Zumbo, probably aware of the discrepancy, seems to suggest as much: « *da dove l'editore abbia avuto notizia di tale testimonium non ci è dato sapere* » (19). However, Boudreaux did leave the source of his *testimonium* on record, the catalogue produced by Heinrich Schenkl (20):

« CHELTENHAM. Bibliothèque de sir Thomas Phillipps.

H. Schenkl, *Bibliotheca patrum latinorum Britannica*, Wien, 1891 sqq., I, 2, p. 69: 'n° 4211, 4°, ch(artaceus), s. XV, Oppianus de piscatione et venatione graece (woran ein γένος Ὀππιανοῦ)'. » (21)

Schenkl's description confirmed the numeration given by Boudreaux, and in addition added a new element of incongruence with regard to the *Yalensis* 255, since according to Schenkl's information, the contents of the Phillipps codex should apparently be limited to the *Haliutica* and the *Cynegetica* with a preceding *Vita Oppiani*, thereby indicating only one γένος Ὀππιανοῦ. There now seemed to be a distinct possibility that the Phillipps codex, as mentioned by Boudreaux, was in actual fact not the same as the Phillipps codex now known as the *Yalensis* 255, and hence that there were apparently two Phillipps codices transmitting the *Cynegetica*: the 4211 and the 6435 codex. The question that needed to be answered therefore, was why Boudreaux had only made reference to the ms. 4211. Clearly, in order to make any sensible speculation, it was necessary to consult the Schenkl catalogue.

In Schenkl's inventory of the Phillipps manuscripts, three appear containing the poems by Oppian (treated as one single poet), with the following numbers and description (22):

3086. (*Meerman 296*). 8°, ch., s. XVI. 1. Oppiani haliuticon libri IV. 2. Euripidis Phoenissae. 3. Aeschylis Persae. 4. Pselli carmen de dogmate Christiano. 5. Xenophon de arte equestri. 6. Anonymi XII labores Herculis.

4211. 4°, ch., s. XV. Oppianus de piscatione et venatione graece; (*woran ein γένος Ὀππιανοῦ*).

6435. fol., ch., s. XV. 1. Oppiani Haliutica. 2. Coluthus de raptu Helenae. 3. Tryphiodori Ilii excidium. 4. Dionysii descriptio orbis. Graece.

The Schenkl catalogue clearly shows that numbers 6435 and 4211 belong to distinct codices in the Phillipps library. The omission of the *Cynegetica* from the contents of codex 6435,

(18) ZUMBO (n. 9), pp. 64 s.

(19) ZUMBO (n. 7), p. 95.

(20) Here we reproduce literally the text which appears in BOUDREAUX (n. 1), p.14, corresponding to the section « La tradition manuscrite. Liste des manuscrits. I.-Manuscrits conservés ». It seems that Zumbo did not consult the cited page in the Boudreaux edition as he never refers to it, always making reference to p. 2, n. 2, cf. ZUMBO (n. 9), p. 64, n. 8 and (n. 7), p. 95, n. 3.

(21) Boudreaux took his quote directly from H. SCHENKL, *Bibliotheca patrum latinorum Britannica*, Wien, 1891-1908, vol. I.2, « Die Phillipps'sche Bibliothek in Cheltenham » (= SAW 126-127), Wien, 1892 (repr. Hildesheim, 1969), p. 69.

(22) Here we reproduce literally the text of the description of each codex exactly as it appears in SCHENKL (n. 21), pp. 56 (n° 3086), 69 (n° 4211) and 83 (n° 6435). According to p. 84 of the *Index* of the catalogue (*Bibliotheca patrum latinorum Britannica*. XIII, vol. III.4, « *Index* », Wien, 1907) only the Phillipps library possessed codices of Oppian.

whether this was due to an oversight on the part of Schenkl or perhaps that of his own source, explains why, having consulted the catalogue, Boudreaux failed to include Phillipps ms. 6435, while on the other hand including the ms. 4211 in the list of extant codices of the *Cynegetica*. The rectification of this oversight logically would convert the Phillipps ms. 6435, (in effect the present-day *Yalensis* 255 as collated by Zumbo), in the nineteenth extant manuscript of the poem. However, this hypothesis should necessarily be confirmed with the location of ms. 4211, which, again, turned out to be the missing codex (as it had been for Boudreaux), and, above all, with the verification of its contents, since the reliability of the Schenkl catalogue had proved to be suspect as a result of the error committed with respect to ms. 6435.

Bearing in mind the hazardous dispersal of the Phillipps collection, of which the *Yalensis* 255 was a good example⁽²³⁾, considerable detective work was necessary in order to discover the fate of the *Phillippicus* 4211. However, through a series of investigations, we were able to reconstruct the external history of the manuscript from before and, more importantly, after its period in the Phillipps library, up until its present location. Firstly, we were able to discover the owner of the codex immediately prior to Phillipps through his own privately-printed *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum* (Middle Hill, 1837). According to this catalogue, included in the work by A.N.L. Munby⁽²⁴⁾, we learned that the group of codices 4194-4221 were acquired from « Payne »⁽²⁵⁾. The cryptic annotation of the British bibliophile revealed the names of John Thomas Payne and Henry Foss, the chief partners of the firm Pall Mall, from whom Phillipps had bought hundreds of manuscripts prior to 1837⁽²⁶⁾. Codex 4211, together with the rest of the collection, must have remained from then on in Thirlestaine House, Cheltenham, the mansion where Phillipps lived until his death in 1872.

Shortly after the death of Phillipps, the dispersal of his collection began in the following general terms. In his final will, Sir Thomas Phillipps stipulated that his daughter Catherine, married to the Reverend John Fenwick, should receive all his main possessions including the immense library, and after her, her third son Thomas Fitzroy Fenwick was to inherit them and then his children successively. It was Phillipps's most heartfelt wish « that no manuscript or rare printed book shall ever be taken out of Thurlestaine (sic) House aforesaid under any pretence »⁽²⁷⁾. His heirs, however, lacked the necessary funds to maintain such a legacy,

(23) The ms. 6435, acquired by Laurence Witten, was a donation to the University of Yale from the Jacob Ziskind Trust in 1957. Cf. ZUMBO (n. 9), pp. 64 s.
 (24) A.N.L. MUNBY, *Phillipps Studies*, (I-V, Cambridge, 1951-1960), vol. III, *The Formation of the Phillipps Library up to the year 1840*, Cambridge, 1954, pp. 143-169 (Appendix A, « The sources from which Phillipps obtained Mss. 1-10817 »).

(25) Cf. MUNBY (n. 24), III, p. 156. The ms. 6435 is found within the group « 4912-6459 Lord Guildford's MSS. », that is to say, proceeding from the library of Frederick North, 5th Earl of Guilford (MUNBY, *ibid.*, pp. 56 and 159; with regard to Phillipps own mistake in spelling the name *Guilford*, cf. MUNBY, *ibid.*, p.144).
 (26) See MUNBY (n. 24), III, pp. 43-5. ZUMBO (n. 9), p. 64, notifies that in f. 1b of the ms. 6435 « una mano dal ductus spesso scrive Payne ». According to MUNBY (*ibid.*, p. 56) Phillipps bought over 1560 items from North's library collection « at the sale of the manuscripts and from the booksellers subsequently ». It is probable that Payne and Foss bought the codex before Phillipps when that library was sold off between 8-12 December 1830, as happened to the codices 3886-3889, 7844 and 10384-10385 (see MUNBY, *ibid.*, pp. 154, 163 and 166).
 (27) Phillipps's will is reprinted in MUNBY (n. 24), vol. II, *The Family Affairs of Sir Thomas Phillipps*, Cambridge, 1952, pp. 106-115 (Appendix A, « The will of Sir Thomas Phillipps »). It is from there (p. 108) that the cited clause is taken.

thus in 1886 Thomas Fitzroy began the selective sale of lots of manuscripts and printed books to governments ⁽²⁸⁾, institutions and individual buyers, either through private transactions or public auction at Sotheby's. After Thomas Fitzroy's death in 1938, his nephew Alan G. Fenwick took over the administration of the estate. However, when war broke out in 1939, he found himself obliged to cede Thirlestaine House to the government. The collection was packed and stored in the cellars of the mansion where it was to remain untouched until 1946, when it was transported to London to its new owners, Lionel and Philip Robinson who had acquired it for £100,000. Shortly afterwards in 1949, Thirlestaine House was bought by Cheltenham College. The Robinson brothers, the main partners in William H. Robinson Ltd, a renowned bookselling firm, continued to sell the Phillipps manuscripts, books and documents to both public and private sectors until 1956, when with neither of the two having a male heir to take over the running of the business, they decided to shut down the firm and retire ⁽²⁹⁾. Nevertheless, the dispersion of the Phillipps collection was to continue until the 1970s, when Sotheby's sold off its last sections including ms. 4211, one of the last manuscripts to be auctioned and sold, « on 8th July 1975, lot 3402, and was bought for £700 in the name of Norman » ⁽³⁰⁾. This information, which Sotheby's kindly facilitated to us, proved fortuitous and definitive. Although it did not reveal the final resting place of the codex, it enabled the indisputable association to be made between the Phillipps ms. 4211 with the *Minneapolis Mus. Bakk. cod. graec. I* which Fajen had written about in the second of his very valuable works on the manuscript tradition of Oppian of Cilicia's *Haliutica*, and whose last owners had been T. Phillipps and J. Norman ⁽³¹⁾, the latter having purchased it at auction. Thus, with a new name and number, the former *Phillippicus* 4211 had ended its own particular odyssey reaching Minneapolis (U.S.A.), where it was added to the ever expanding collection of manuscripts and incunabula of *The Bakken* (a Library and Museum of Electricity in Life) ⁽³²⁾.

Once the *Phillippicus* 4211 had been located, it only remained for us to verify its contents. Fajen's description, and above all the very complete one supplied to us by Sotheby's, once checked against the micro-film copy of the codex kindly facilitated to us by the *Center for Research Libraries* (Chicago), confirmed our initial suspicions as to the reliability of the Schenkl catalogue. The *Minneapolis Mus. Bakk. cod. graec. I* (= *ex Phillipps* 4211) is a

(28) Very soon after, in 1887, took place the sale to the German government of the codices 1388-2010, the Meerman collection of manuscripts, « Decus Bibliothecae Philippicae », according to Phillipps himself (see MUNBY (n. 24), III, p. 148). This had already been pointed out by SCHENKL (n. 21), p. 43 (although Schenkl mistakenly records mss. 1338-2010).

(29) The dispersal of the collection until 1956 is meticulously detailed by MUNBY (n. 24), vol.V, *The Dispersal of the Library*, Cambridge, 1960. We would like to sincerely thank Mister T.S. Pearce of Cheltenham College for his account of the recent history of the house of Phillipps which he relayed to us *per litteras*.

(30) This information was supplied *per litteras* by Dr. Christopher de Hamel of Sotheby's (Western Manuscripts) to whom we also sincerely thank for sending us a copy of the relevant page from the auction catalogue which contains a description of the manuscript along with other data of interest.

(31) F. FAJEN, « Zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der Haliutica des Oppian », *Hermes* 107 (1979), (pp. 286-310) p. 287.

(32) It seems that the reference given by FAJEN (n. 31), p. 287, n. 3, to the « Museum of Electricity in Life at Medtronic (Minneapolis) » might be mistaken. *Medtronic* is a Minneapolis library but distinct from *The Bakken*, and possesses no collection of manuscripts.

codex chartaceus (III + 144 + 1ff.) in which only Oppian of Cilicia's *Haliutica*, and a preceding *Vita Oppiani* (f. 1) ⁽³³⁾, were copied. The poem (ff. 2r-144v) is accompanied by few scholia, and with its five books presented in the form of four, missing the vv. 3.642 to 646 (ff. 98r and 98v, having left spaces in the text of 2 and 9 lines respectively), and 4.513 to 5.149 (f. 122r). In the f. 89v a blank space has been left after the vv. 3.449, 450 and 451, as if a verse was missing below each of them. The text ends abruptly in the v. 5.652 (f. 144v), with the last 28 verses also missing from the poem and, as a decorative finishing touch, a tailpiece is added at the end of the folio. The codex was indeed bought from *Payne*, as stated in Phillip's *Catalogus*, although an erased note on a flyleaf mistakenly identifies it as the part of the *Phillippicus* 3086 (Meerman 296) which is now the *Londinensis (Butlerianus)* 11890 ⁽³⁴⁾.

First dated as a fifteenth-century codex, it has since been classified more accurately. According to Sotheby's description, « the watermark of the paper (type of Briquet 3404: 1503) indicates that it was copied in the Veneto ». Consequently, the ms. 4211 would have been copied in the Northwest of Italy at the beginning of the sixteenth century, shortly before the appearance of the *editio princeps* of the *Haliutica*, the Juntine edition prepared by Bernardo Giunta and Marco Musuro (Florence, 1515) ⁽³⁵⁾. The identification of the scribe by Dr. D. Harlfinger with Phrankiskos Bitalios (Francesco Vitali?), whose *manus* signed the *Vindobonensis Phil. gr.* 167 in Vicenza c. 1500 ⁽³⁶⁾, allows the conjecture, due to their proximity in time, that the ms. 4211 was also copied in Vicenza.

The conclusions that this paper leads to are obvious. Firstly, it seems clear, and it has been shown beyond doubt, that the manuscript from the Sir Thomas Phillipps library collated by A. Zumbo, the *Yalensis* 255 (= *ex Phillipps* 6435) does not correspond to the *Phillippicus* 4211, the manuscript mentioned by P. Boudreaux in his edition of Oppian of Apamea's *Cynegetica*. Secondly, it was the errors in the Schenkl catalogue that misled Boudreaux into including the *Phillippicus* 4211, and not the *Phillippicus* 6435, in the list of extant manuscripts of the *Cynegetica*. Thirdly, the *Phillippicus* 4211 is now the *Minneapolis Mus. Bakk. cod. graec.* I, and does not in fact contain Oppian of Apamea's *Cynegetica*. Thus it seems clear that the *Phillippicus* 4211 should be removed from the manuscript tradition of Oppian of Apamea's *Cynegetica*, since it never belonged there, and it should be replaced by the *Phillippicus* 6435, that is to say, the *Yalensis* 255 collated by A. Zumbo.

University of Cádiz

Tomás SILVA SÁNCHEZ

(33) This *Vita* corresponds to the one known as Oppian's *Vita a* (cf. WESTERMANN (n. 8), pp. 63-65); the end has been replaced by the epigram Ὀππιανὸς σελίδεσσιν ἀλίπλοα φύλα συνάψας / θήκατο πάσι νέοις ὄρον ἀπειρέσιον (= A. Pl. 4.311).

(34) The *Phillippicus* 3086 was divided into two, with the first part now being the above cited *Londinensis* which contains the *Haliutica*.

(35) Here the description in the Sotheby's catalogue is mistaken in identifying the Aldine edition (Venice, 1517) as the *editio princeps* of the *Haliutica*. In fact, although it does include the *Haliutica*, the Aldine edition of 1517 is actually the *princeps* of the *Cynegetica*.

(36) Cf. J. Bick, « Die Schreiber der Wiener griechischen Handschriften », *Museion*, Abhandlungen, I, Vienna-Prague-Leipzig, 1920, pp. 58 ss.