keeping with the Alexandrian taste for dialect mixtures”. However, when choosing that form Callimachus may also have been influenced by the fact that in that case the adjective would contain the name Didyma, the place of a famous temple of Apollo 4). This temple, like many other Greek ones 5), was destroyed by the Persians in 494, but later rebuilt, and it rose to great prominence in Hellenistic times. Surely, a poet like Callimachus would not miss the opportunity to allude to that temple in this ‘Apolline’ context.
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1) F. Williams, Callimachus: Hymn to Apollo (Oxford 1978).
2) G. Jacopi, Clara Rhodos 6/7 (1932/3), 256.

SCALIGER AND MANILIUS

Scaliger improved the text of Manilius as much through acquaintance with G in his second edition (Leyden 1600) as without manuscripts in his first (Paris 1579). G itself he never saw: he transcribed a collation by Susius into a copy of the ed. Basil. 1551 (Firmicus Maternus etc.), now H 5 14 Art. in the Bodleian 1). A copy of the same edition at Leyden, 761 B 3, contains an elegant collation of G. Wondering whether it might be Susius’s, I ordered the one volume listed under his name in the handwritten catalogue of libri annotati: 756 C 23, an Aratus (Paris 1559) that proclaims “Sum Jacobi D.F.P.N. Susii 1573”. This ex libris and the annotations are in the same hand as the collation of G.

I recently pointed out that another Manilius in the Bodleian, Auct. S 6 12, is the very copy of his first edition that Scaliger submitted with corrections to the printer of his second 2). Another copy of the ed. Basil. 1551 at Leyden, 761 B 2, may well be what he submitted to the printer of his first. The text has been emended throughout, most conspicuously by transposition, and the emendations are his. In the middle of p. 223 the two lines Has stellis ... fabricator Olympi (5.30-1) are added after Iunget ... (5.709), and then comes “*** Laissez espace de six ou sept vers”. In his first
edition three asterisks and a space of six lines duly follow *Unget ...
Fabricator Olympi*. Admittedly there are no printer’s marks like the reddish-brown crayon in Auct. S 6 12.

The first page of text has at the head ‘collatus ad exemplar Gemblacense’, but the collation runs only to p. 176.10 (2.774). It must have been made after the emendations, whether directly from Susius’s collation or indirectly from Scaliger’s transcript. In discussing a manuscript of the *Florilegium Gallicum* B. L. Ullman castigates “a reader whose work throughout the manuscript is an object lesson to all emenders” 3); “if you have the urge to emend”, he continues, “take a look at this unknown scholar’s brain storms and you will be cured forever”. A look at Scaliger’s volume would cause a relapse: some readings of G had no need to be written out in full, because they already stood in the margin by conjecture.

I append a few remarks on other *Maniliana* in the Bodleian.

Linc. D 5 13 (Leyden 1600)

Garrod speaks about this as follows 4): “On the first page is written ‘P. Pithoei Luyerii’. The volume contains a collation of some unnamed MS., and at the foot of p. 131 there is a subscriptio: ‘collatus cum MS., Calendis Iuliis MDXXIII. Tricassib. Pithou’. MDXXIII is clearly a blunder for MXIIIC, for Pithou died in 1596”. In a footnote he adds: “Strangely enough, Pithou makes a similar blunder in an Antwerp edition (1567) of Maximianus ...: ‘contuli cum MS. Puteanorum fratrum Lutetiae MDXI Kal. Sep. Petrus Pithoeus’ ...”. He does not explain how Pithoeus came to be annotating an edition published four years after his death. In fact, as he could have seen from the flyleaf of the Maximianus (Linc. 8° D 183, actually dated 1569), both collations were made by a nephew of the better known Petrus Pithoeus 5). The manuscript of Manilius was identified by Housman, V xvii n. †.

Auct. S 5 29 (Paris 1579)

As I have said elsewhere 6), Garrod was wrong to contest Ellis’s identification of the manuscript collated in Auct. O 5 17 (Bologna 1474) with Leid. Voss. Lat. O 18. The notes in Auct. S 5 29 he regarded as a second collation of the same manuscript, though “the two collations sometimes disagree in small points, and Auct. S 5 29 is clearly rather carelessly made” 7). What he failed to notice (not surprisingly in the absence of an express distinction) is that up to 2.100 a collation of another manuscript had been entered first; at 2.96, for instance, both *cursibus* and *curribus* are given alongside *cornibus*, and *curribus*, the reading of the Vossianus, was written second. Readings that recur in Auct. O 5 17 were