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Abstract

The Latin translations of Oribasius are much earlier than the manuscripts of the Greek tradition, as is well known. In his edition of the Synopsis (1926) Ioannes Raeder pointed out the importance of the Latin versions for the constitutio textus and showed how useful they could be to solve several problems when the manuscript tradition was insufficient. A systematic comparison between the Greek and the Latin Oribasius is yet to be done thoroughly, but this type of analysis appears to be very promising already. In this contribution we will examine the relationship between the Latin and the Greek tradition of the Eclogae and the Synopsis in detail. We will analyse a few significant parts. Through this comparison of the two traditions it will be possible to interpret and, at times, to propose better corrections of the text in Latin or in Greek.

The Latin and Greek Tradition of Oribasius’ Corpus

The manuscript tradition of Oribasius in Latin includes the redaction La, with ninth–seventeenth-century manuscripts, and the redaction Aa, with seventh–ninth-century manuscripts. The Greek tradition, on the other hand, is later and includes twelfth–fifteenth-century manuscripts. For the Eclogae there is a codex unicus from the tenth century.

Here we provide a brief and schematic description of the tradition:

The Latin tradition La, redaction La, has been transmitted in the following manuscripts:1

※ Translated by Michele Lucchesi, subsequently revised by Jon Wilcox. All translations from Greek and Latin are ours unless otherwise noted.

1 For practical reasons, the sigla of the manuscripts have been changed as follows: L (= La); A (= Li); S (= St); E (= Bas); D (= Dr); F (= Lond), cf. Messina (2008: 78 n. 1).
L (= La) Laon, Bibliothèque municipale 424, ninth century.² Manuscript in minuscule script from the second quarter of the ninth century with marginal notes (f° 145v, 163r, 186v) from the eleventh century;³ Molinier⁴ and Mørland⁵ date it back to the tenth century. It comes from Notre-Dame de Laon, but it has been written in northern Italy.

A (= Li) Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek, Rep. I 24, ninth century.⁶ Parchment manuscript in minuscule script from the second half of the ninth century with marginal notes of an almost contemporaneous hand, and of another hand from the eleventh century.⁷ Possible provenance is southern France.⁸

S (= St) Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek HB.XI.8, ninth century.⁹ Parchment manuscript, written in Caroline minuscule script from the first half of the ninth century, with glosses, corrections, and both marginal and interlinear observations by slightly later hands. Possible origin is the Romance area.

B Vatican City, Vatican Library, Barb. Lat. 160, olim Barb. 767, eleventh century.¹⁰ Parchment manuscript from the eleventh century.¹¹ Probable origin is central Italy.

⁴ Cf. Molinier (1876: 6, XIX).
⁵ Cf. Mørland (1940: 6).
⁶ For the complete description of the manuscript, cf. Beccaria (1956: 221–222).
⁷ Naumann (1838: 30, n° 97) dated the manuscript to the eleventh century. The same dating is accepted by Molinier and Mørland.
¹⁰ For the complete description of the manuscript cf. Beccaria (1956: 324–33); Pellegrin/Fohlen/Jeudy/Riou (1975: 189–191); Molinier (1876: 6, XIX–XX) refers to this manuscript as Ba: “Bibliothèque Barberino, à Rome, n° 767, f° 199”.
¹¹ Mørland (1940: 6) dates it to the twelfth century.