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Abstract

Prolegomenon to an Edition of the Pseudo-Virgilian Culex

Lisa L. St. Louis
University of Ottawa, 2001

Supervisor:
Professor Denis Brearley

This thesis lays the foundation for a new edition of the pseudo-Virgilian Culex. Fifty manuscripts containing the text are gathered along with all relevant information which would assist a scholar in locating, identifying and tracing the history of each one. The findings are presented in the form of a catalogue. Next, the manuscripts are collated in detail and their variant readings are entered into a computer program which is specifically designed to determine the relationship between manuscripts. The results prove that some manuscripts belong to the Florilegium Gallicum or Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus groups which have been defined by previous researchers. Others have been copied from printed books and are valuable only for conjectures as they add nothing to the construction of a stemma. The data from the manuscripts forms the basis for an apparatus criticus along with many readings from incunabula. The main goal of the thesis is to present late manuscripts which have not been sufficiently studied as well as incunabula and other rare books which are not readily accessible to scholars. During the composition of the apparatus, it becomes apparent that old conjectures have been improperly attributed to some scholars and that more work needs to be done to assess the contribution of certain individuals. Once the apparatus is complete, the task of editing the text begins. Professor Clausen’s Oxford Classical Text serves as the starting point but original conjectures and changes proposed by other scholars are also inserted into the text. Finally, these alterations as well as issues of grammar and scansion are discussed in a commentary at the end of the work.
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Introduction

The Culex Throughout the Ages

Upon first glance, the Culex hardly seems to be the sort of poem which would merit a second look, let alone lengthy volumes of scholarship. It is a short work of 414 lines which recounts the story of a goatherd who is nearly attacked by a snake during his afternoon nap but is saved by a mosquito. The philanthropic insect bites the elderly man in order to warn him and is dispatched to the next world by a blow from the goatherd’s hand. After this rude awakening, the man notices the snake and crushes it with a tree branch. Once his animals have been cared for, the goatherd returns home and goes to sleep. In a dream, the ghost of the mosquito appears to the goatherd and berates its murderer for his lack of gratitude. It describes the horrors of the Underworld which surround it. When the goatherd wakes up the next morning, he erects a massive and magnificent tomb for the little creature.

The subject matter is decidedly lowbrow, the bucolic themes well-worn and the versification clumsy at best. The poem does not seem to have much to recommend it until one examines the literary echoes that run throughout the work. It is hardly surprising to find similarities here and there in works of authors who praised the joys of country life (Lucretius De rerum natura 2.24 ff. and Horace Odes 2.18) but on every page there are reminders of Virgil. Did the person who wrote this poem know the works of Virgil by heart and “get away with” the ultimate forgery by passing off his work as Virgil’s own? That is one possibility. The other option is much more romantic, a veritable dream come true for scholars. Is it possible that this dreadful but rather charming little poem was, in fact, written by Virgil himself at a young age before he had perfected his craft?
Unfortunately, the ancient world did not unlock the mystery for us. After Virgil’s death in 19 B.C., no collected edition of the poems appeared and there was silence on the matter until the second half of the first century A.D. when Martial, Statius and Lucan mentioned the poem. Martial offered a dinner guest a copy of the *Culex* as a present with these words:

Accipe facundi Culicem, studiose, Maronis, ne nucibus positis “Arma uirumque” legas.  
(Martial *Epigrams* 14.185.1-2)

In another poem he assigned the *Culex* to a time when Virgil was still an inexperienced poet:

Protinus “Italiam” concepit et “arma uirumque,”  
qui modo uix Culicem fleuerat ore rudi.  
(Martial *Epigrams* 8.56.19-20)

Statius decided that the *Siluae* should be published despite his concern that they had been hastily composed. He used the example of the *Culex* to show that even serious poets were allowed to have a lighter side:

Quid enim oportet me huius quoque auctoritate editionis onerari, qui adhuc pro Thebaide mea, quamuis me reliquerit, timeo? Sed et Culicem legitimus et Batrachomachiam etiam agnoscimus, nec quisquam est influstrium poetarum qui non aliquid operibus suis stilo remissiorem praeluserit.  
(Statius *Siluae* 1 praefatio)

The same author sent a poem to Lucan’s widow in honour of Lucan’s birthday. He pretended that Lucan was still a baby and prophesied that he would write major works before the age at which Virgil had composed the *Culex*:

haec primo iuuenis canes sub aequo,  
ante annos Culicis Maroniani.  
(Statius *Siluae* 2.7.73-74)
Suetonius, writing in the second century A.D., ascribed a boastful utterance to Lucan which can be dated to the 60s A.D. when Lucan was in his twenties:

aetatem et initia sua cum Vergilio comparans ausus sit dicere: 'et quantum mihi restat ad Culicem?'
(Suetonius *Vita Lucani*)

After Suetonius, the *Culex* was not mentioned by name until the fourth century when Aelius Donatus and Maurus Seruius Honoratus, writers of two of the *Vitae Vergiliana*, listed other works which were also supposedly Virgil's. Questions such as the reliance or non-reliance of Donatus on Suetonius and what Virgil wanted his executors to do with the minor poems (if one takes the view that they were, in fact, his) are beyond the scope of this brief outline of the poem’s history.¹ Some *Vitae* like the *Vita Bernensis* are used by scholars to bolster claims of Virgilian authorship by proving that Virgil was acquainted with Octavian at a young age. It is a general rule that data from ancient lives must be used with care. This is especially true since Upson has shown that all the *Vitae* are derived from Suetonius, either via St. Jerome or Donatus.² It is enough here to quote the relevant passages from the two most important works:

poeticam puer auspicatus in Ballistam ludi magistrum ob infamiam latrociniorum coopertum lapidibus distichon fecit:
   'monte sub hoc lapidum tegitur Ballista sepultus;
   nocte die tutum carpe uiator iter';

---


deinde Catalepton et Priapea et Epigrammata et Diras, item Cirim et Culicem cum esset annorum XXVI\textsuperscript{3} . . . scripsit etiam de qua ambigitur Aetnam.

*Vita Donati* 53-59, 67

primum ab illo hoc distichon factum est in Ballistam latronem:
‘monte sub hoc lapidum tegitur Ballista sepultus:
nocte die tutum carpe uiator iter.’

scripsit etiam septem siue octo libros hos: Cirin Aetnam Culicem Priapeia Catalepton Epigrammata Copam Diras.

*Vita Seruii* 10-15

Nonius Marcellus in his *De Compendiosa Doctrina* added another fourth-century reference when he discussed different possible genders for the noun *labrusca*. He would have the last word on the subject until the ninth century:


*Nonius Marcellus De compendiosa doctrina* 211.23-26

Let us continue our look at authors who helped to keep the memory of our poem alive. In the ninth century, the monk Sigismund de Meisterlin of Murbach wrote a catalogue of the manuscripts held by his monastery. The library had a manuscript, sadly now lost, which contained “Vergilius bucolicon. Georgicon. Liber Eneydos. Eiusdem

\textsuperscript{3} In Hardie’s *Vitae Vergilianiæ antiquæ* (Oxford, 1966), two elements are likely to confuse the reader. First of all, it must be noted that XXVI is an emendation and is not contained in the manuscripts of Donatus. The manuscripts give the ages XV, XVI or XVII with XVI being the most popular. Rose has also discovered that Hardie wrongly attributed XXVI to Joseph Justus Scaliger. For a complete discussion of the problem, see Kenneth Rose, “Problems of Chronology in Lucan’s Career,” *Classical Philology* 97 (1966): 379-396. For Scaliger’s actual opinion and the source of the number XXVI, please see the appropriate sections later in this history. Further information on *Vitae Vergilianiæ* may be found in Karl Bayer, *Vergil-Viten* (Zurich: Artemis und Winkler Verlag, 1995); G. Brugnoli and F. Stok, “Fontes ad uitam Vergilii pertinentes,” *Encyclopaedia Virgiliana* 5** (Rome: Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1991) 427-540 and in Virginia Brown, “*Vitæ Vergilianæ* in Unpublished Virgilian Commentaries (Saec. XV and XVI),” *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honour of Wendell Clausen* ed. Peter Knox and Clive Foss (Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998) 174-198.
Dire. Culicis. Ethne. Copa. Mecenas. Ciris. Catalepion. Priapeya. Moretum.” It is interesting to note how the list of Virgil’s works has grown since the fourth-century Vitae. In the twelfth century, Thierry de Saint-Trond used the Culex, a poem about an unburied corpse, as a starting point for a poem about his dog which had disappeared and thus could never be buried.\footnote{Jean Préaux, “Du Culex de Virgile à son pastiche par Thierry de Saint-Trond,” Présence de Virgile: Actes du colloque des 9, 11 et 12 décembre, ed. R. Chevallier (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1978) 195.} Alexander of Neckham, one century later, believed that Virgil was describing a personal encounter with a snake in the Culex but soon decided otherwise.\footnote{Comparetti 148, 263.} Vincent of Beauvais, who died in 1264, seems to have been the first person to reject the authenticity of the poems which had been ascribed to Virgil in the Vitae. In his Speculum historiale he wrote:

Virgilius tres libros tantum creditur edidisse: ut in epitaphio eius apparent ubi dictur:

Cecini pascua, rura, duces.
Per quae tria significantur Bucolica, Georgica, et Aeneida. Proinde Virgilius de Culice et Virgilius de Aetna . . . inter autores apocryphos separandi sunt.
(Vincent Speculum historiale 6.62)

Usually Carolus Ruæus [Charles de la Rue] (1643-1725), or François Oudin, an eighteenth-century scholar, are credited with the discovery either because modern scholars are unaware of Vincent’s comments or because they do not consider him much of an expert.

\footnote{Birger Munk Olsen, L’étude des auteurs classiques au XIe et XIIe siècles, Tome III 1ère Partie (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1987) 167-169.}
The ninth-century catalogue which was alluded to briefly above marked the start of a whole new phase in the life of the Culex, the manuscript tradition. Most of us have seen pictures of the famous Virgil manuscripts, particularly those from the Vatican. Unfortunately, the Culex was not included with them. They date back as far as the fourth century A.D., whereas the earliest Culex manuscripts started to appear in the ninth century and were produced, strangely enough, until the nineteenth century. It is dangerous to jump to conclusions about the authenticity of the poem solely based on the silence of fourth-century manuscripts because later the Culex was frequently included with the works of Virgil and every title proclaimed that it was indeed Virgil’s. One is lucky, though, if it turns up in a Virgil manuscript. Often the eyes of cataloguers miss it because it has survived as a couplet, in the middle of some other author, in a manuscript unconnected with Virgil. It seems that mediaeval scribes liked certain parts of the poem such as the praise of country life (58ff.) or the mosquito’s epitaph at the end (413-414). The vast range in age of the manuscripts should not mislead anyone. In any library in Europe, there are mostly fourteenth- and fifteenth-century manuscripts of the Culex and very few earlier or later examples. Palaeography fans may be disappointed with a steady diet of only Carolingian, Gothic and Humanistic scripts but it is, perhaps, a good thing for reasons of access that most manuscripts of the Culex are the “poor side of the family” and not the treasures of the world.7

It is possible, after one has examined Culex manuscripts from each century, to make a few generalizations. The text is hopelessly corrupt. Lines have fallen out or are in the wrong place. Names of mythological people or geographical places are

---

7 A notable exception to this rule is FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Plut. 33.31, saec. xiv which was copied by Boccaccio.
unrecognizable. Once printed books appeared, the quest to determine what was in the original manuscript of the Culex no longer hung on the question of which manuscripts descended from which others but also which manuscripts had been entirely or partially copied from books.

The advent of printing brought about a flurry of Virgil editions, some consisting simply of text and others enriched with commentary. Of the commentaries, most were very basic compared to the learned treatises of ancient times but they showed a movement from the passive copying of previous centuries to the active thought required for textual emendation and identification of obscure people and places. A glance at the Ascensius edition of 1529 shows that the list of works attributed to Virgil by Seruius, Donatus and the Murbach catalogue has grown to such an extent that we must wonder how our poet had time for the Aeneid when he was consumed by such important subjects as wine, women and the letter Y. Josse Bade Ascensius (1462-1535) and Domitius Calderinus (1447-1478) dutifully printed dozens of poems and traded comments concerning the authenticity of several of them. Aetna and Elegiae in Maecenatem were rejected outright but Ciris was accepted. De rosis nascentibus was ascribed to either Virgil or Ausonius while the Priapea and De se ipso were given to Ovid.\(^8\)

Another commentator, Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609), believed that Virgil was the author of the Culex but thought that it was the work of a mature man, not a boy.

---

\(^8\) While the 1529 edition was typical of its time, Virgilian content remained fluid. On this account, one must peruse several editions in order to appreciate the magnitude of the web of apocryphal poetry which surrounded the Eclogues, Georgics and Aeneid. Despite the charm of the rare books, the unusual spelling is troublesome and it is preferable to study the opuscula in a scholarly edition with explanatory notes. See Heinrich Meyer, Anthologia veterum latinorum epigrammatum et poematum (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: apud Gerhardum Fleischerum, 1835).
As we have already seen in the section on Donatus, scholars tend to misquote Scaliger. He never gave Virgil’s age as twenty-six and, in fact, said that he did not know how old Virgil was when he wrote the poem. In any case, he was certain that Donatus the “ignobilis grammaticus” was wrong to say fifteen. In his 1573 edition of the Culex and the other minor poems, he called them Publilii Vergilii Maronis Appendix for the first time and the name stuck. Today we know them as the Appendix Vergiliana but we must be wary of using the term “collection” since their relationship to Virgil and to each other is tenuous at best. Each member of this unusual group has its own manuscript tradition and has been variously supported or rejected over the centuries in its claim of authenticity. Modern scholars almost unanimously agree that Virgil did not write any of the poems which accompany the Culex.

The seventeenth century marked the start of the modern era in the study of the Culex. Scaliger had raised questions about Virgil’s age as transmitted in Donatus but had not questioned Virgilian authorship. New voices not only replayed the age debate but even began to discuss whether the Culex which had come down through the centuries was Virgil’s unchanged original, the original with some interpolated sections, a forgery which had replaced the lost original, or a forgery with no Virgilian original. Charles de la Rue had Virgil writing the Culex at twenty-six. If an Oxford Classical Text of the Vitae appears in the future, it should no longer cite Scaliger as the source of that number. According to de la Rue, our Culex is a forgery “ab inepto aliquo posteriorum aetatum

---

9 Joseph Scaliger, Publilii Vergilii Maronis appendix cum supplemento multorum antehac nunquam excusorum poematum ueterum poetarum (Lugduni [Lyon]: apud Guliel. Rouiullium, 1573) 265-266.
scriptore fictum” intended to replace Virgil’s lost work. François Oudin agreed, adding that Virgil wrote a Culex between the ages of twenty-five and thirty. He thought that a Vandal or African could have composed our Culex as a kind of patchwork of Virgil’s other works. In 1775, Christian Gottlob Heyne proposed the second of our five options, namely, that the Culex had a true Virgilian core which, over the years, had been surrounded by spurious verses. His Culex probabiliter restitutus separated (or so he believed) the true verses from the false with the result that only one-quarter of the poem remained. This view was so unpopular that it was even criticized by Sillig who revised Heyne’s work in 1832.

The final section of our history deals with modern times and the questions which scholars have been raising since the late 1800s and continue to grapple with in the new millennium. There tends to be an “all or nothing” approach to Culex authorship today and the “Yes” side still enjoys a surprising amount of support, particularly among Italian

10 I found de la Rue’s notes attached to a later edition of Vergil (London, 1750) with no indication of page numbers. They must have been taken from Carolus Ruæus, P. V. M. opera interpretatione et notis illustravit C. Ruæus . . . ad usum serenissimi Delphini (Paris, 1675).


12 Christian Gottlob Heyne, P. Virgilii Maronis opera varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustrata, Tomus Quartus (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: Sumtibus Caspari Fritsch, 1775). I cannot supply the page numbers as I did not find that edition. I used the third edition from 1793 which has the information on pages 9-13 and 76-87. Distler states that all four volumes of the first edition appeared in 1767. See Paul Distler, Vergil and Vergiliana (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1966) 213. That information appears to be incorrect.

scholars.\textsuperscript{14} The "No" side generally believes that our \textit{Culex} is a forgery and that Virgil never composed a \textit{Culex} at all. Both sides take a keen interest in determining when the poem was written and the "Yes" side has added the number twenty-one as another possible age of Virgil.\textsuperscript{15} Those who take a negative view assign dates to the poem which range from during Virgil's lifetime to the time of the Vandals in the sixth century A.D. Some even try to prove that it belongs to Ovid.\textsuperscript{16}

The twentieth century saw the birth of different methods for assessing the probability of Virgilian authorship. These methods which are still popular today include studies of language, metre, historical evidence and the relationship between the \textit{Culex} and the works of Greek and Latin authors. One scholar uses a scientific approach and another relies on subjective criteria like taste and sustained perfection. Statistics which appear to point to Virgil as the author in one article are shown to prove the exact opposite in another. Even the study of borrowings made by the author of the \textit{Culex} from other authors is fraught with danger as sometimes similarities are not, in fact, borrowings at all. As Glenn Most wittily declares, "The \textit{Culex}'s sheep eat the kinds of vines and shrubs they do, neither only because real sheep do nor necessarily because those in the first

\textsuperscript{14} For a list of all those who have voted for or against Virgilian authorship throughout the ages, see Dieter Güntzschel, \textit{Beiträge zur Datierung des Culex} (Aschendorf: Aschendorffsche Buchdruckerei, 1972) 241-257. His bibliography of \textit{Culex} scholarship is complete and carefully documented.

\textsuperscript{15} For the names of scholars who favour XXI, see Anthony Barrett, "The Poetry of the Culex," diss., University of Toronto, 1968, 54.

\textsuperscript{16} See Güntzschel 232 (on R.S. Radford).
Eclogue do, but instead because those are the kinds of vegetation the sheep of pastoral poetry, of the sort found in the first Eclogue, eat."\textsuperscript{17}

It seems likely that Virgil did not write the Culex which has come down to us and, in fact, never wrote a Culex at all. Glenn Most’s work mirrors my personal assumptions. He believes that the forger “knew that Virgil had written the Eclogues, the Georgics, and the Aeneid, in that order and nothing else, and was making reference to that fact in the structure of his poem.” According to Most, if one defends Virgilian authorship of the Culex, then one is making the ludicrous claim that “Virgil . . . as a young man unknowingly anticipated his whole future career.”\textsuperscript{18} It is impossible to be certain when the poem was written but one can safely rule out the lifetimes of Virgil, his executors, and Augustus. That puts us at least in the reign of Tiberius (began A.D. 14) on the early end of the scale. Culex 412 may be imitating Ovid’s Tristia 5.13.29 which can be dated to around A.D. 12 and this would push the \textit{terminus post quem} back slightly.\textsuperscript{19} Two years will not make much of a difference. On the opposite end, if we accept that Lucan made a statement about the Culex, we have to set a date of at least a few years before his death in A.D. 65. Furthermore, if Calpurnius Siculus 7.22 is imitating Culex \textit{77 secunda Pales}, it would seem to move the \textit{terminus ante quem} for the Culex to the early years of Nero’s reign (began A.D. 54) but alas, we have no definite dates for Calpurnius Siculus.\textsuperscript{20}


\textsuperscript{18} Most 208-209.


\textsuperscript{20} Courtney 812.
the present, I ally myself with Eduard Fraenkel and others who lean towards the time of Tiberius.\textsuperscript{21}

**A New Work on the *Culex*: Justification and Preliminary Research**

The incredible outpouring of literature on the authorship question has made the topic unpopular and I certainly would not volunteer to make it the focal point of my thesis. The same can, unfortunately, be said for the number of editions and anyone offering a new text to the world must provide some justification. The *Culex* has been edited many times over yet little of the work has been in English. Anthony Barrett,\textsuperscript{22} Duncan F. Kennedy\textsuperscript{23} and Mark Edward Bailey\textsuperscript{24} devoted their dissertations to the topic but gave their attention to literary issues rather than to manuscripts and textual problems. An edition is a Herculean task which involves gathering a vast array of manuscripts and rare books, collating everything in minute detail, preparing a stemma, analyzing conjectures of previous scholars and, if possible, offering new ones. It necessitates more travel than ordinary research as the material is not usually close at hand and even the best of photocopies cannot be trusted. Despite initial misgivings and thoughts about Sisyphus with his rock, I decided that it would be beneficial to scholarship to bring to light as many

\textsuperscript{21} For the view that the forgery needed time to gain authority and is likely to belong to the reign of Tiberius, see Eduard Fraenkel, “The *Culex*,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 42 (1952): 8.

\textsuperscript{22} See note 15.


little-known resources as possible and to correct errors in readings found in previous editions.

The ninety-eight Culex manuscripts which were uncovered in the course of my research caused a certain feeling of embarras de richesse. It was not feasible or even desirable to present them all. Although I was not the first to discover the existence of the Culex in any given manuscript, I can take pride in the fact that twelve manuscripts which found their way into my work had, to the best of my knowledge, never been mentioned in an edition. The fifty manuscripts in this prolegomenon were chosen for a variety of reasons. It seemed obvious to begin with those found in the editions of others. Most, I soon realized, had found favour with editors because of their age and usefulness in a stemma. Until recently, the prevailing opinion among scholars was that Renaissance manuscripts were worthless because they had been contaminated by printed books. For that reason, few have been studied in any great detail although they are widely available. While they add little to the establishment of a stemma, they are nonetheless valuable for conjectures. Editors are no longer restricting themselves to a small group of manuscripts which, while appropriate for the purposes of a stemma, yield nothing further in terms of textual ameliorations. As palaeographers we must aim for the late Father Leonard Boyle's "integral" view of palaeography and use every aid at our disposal.25 One does not want to be the proverbial "odd man out" when scholars decide to give these manuscripts a second look.

Age and fame or their opposites were important factors in the selection process but there were other criteria to consider as well. In some cases, a pattern of affinity

---

between certain manuscripts was already emerging and new ones were added in the hopes of forming a group. There had to be a representative sample demonstrating reliance or non-reliance of manuscripts on printed books. An attempt was made to show the poem in various states of completeness. Fragments proved to be especially interesting as one could observe from them which parts of the text particularly appealed to scribes and even the smallest samples yielded rewards such as links to the important *Florilegium Gallicum* group of manuscripts. At times, I became fascinated with the life of a historical figure such as Pomponio Leto and tracked down manuscripts and printed books associated with him. The connection of manuscripts to a geographical area such as northern France became apparent and needed to be investigated. Something which began as a simple search for variant readings grew to encompass the formation of private and public libraries, the history of printing and the biographies of the major players of European history.

Once the group of fifty manuscripts had been established, I proceeded to visit forty-four of them in person. I did not allow anyone else to assist in the collation and refused to rely upon the published collations of others. As pre-1900 books were not always catalogued in the ordinary databases of the libraries where I carried out my research, I obtained access to ESTC, I-ISTC, the Hand-Press Book Database, RLIN, World Cat, DBI Link and the Centre for Research Libraries. I ordered photocopies of the most important rare books and even purchased those which could not be copied. At the

---

26 I did not visit libraries in Germany, Spain, Florence or Milan and, thus, had to resort to other means for six manuscripts. In the case of manuscripts which I could not examine personally or those which were nearly illegible, I often requested several different types of copies (microfilms, microfiches, slides, photos or paper) in the hopes of seeing slight nuances.
Library of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, I was graciously permitted to use microfilms of manuscripts as well as the Cranz published and unpublished inventories. From these sources and through the generosity of many people, I managed to find something new among the old.

Organization and Goals of the Prolegomenon

The layout of this prolegomenon to an edition requires more of an explanation than one would expect to find in a full-fledged edition. I considered the possibility of constructing a new stemma and producing a new edition of the Culex but decided that it was wise to do as other classicists had done and lay the foundations of the future edition in a prolegomenon. I accepted Professor Clausen's stemma and text as starting points and looked for opportunities to make improvements. In order to compensate for the fact that I have begun in medias res, I have added some commentary, a feature which one does not always find in editions. It contains a detailed explanation of the changes to the text. Many entries deal with unusual scansion, gender and word order and a few cover literary theory, echoes of other authors and mythological characters. While these issues would be important in their own right in a full and complete literary commentary, they are mentioned here only in so far as they assist in the reconstruction of a given reading. In the

---


future, when a deadline no longer looms, I would like to visit the libraries which hold the
other forty-eight manuscripts on my list and and do a *uardorum* edition in which
Professor Clausen's stemma would be examined more critically.

In the course of writing this thesis, every effort was made to avoid incomplete
manuscript descriptions which lead to a loss of time and money for readers. Scholars
need to be able to rely on the accuracy of the shelf-marks and folio numbers when
ordering costly reproductions from foreign libraries. Unfortunately, editors of classical
texts are not always known for their generosity in supplying the reader with even the
minimum amount of information necessary to find a manuscript or a rare book. To a
neophyte, Corsinianus may either be a manuscript or a distant relative of Coriolanus.
That title alone will not help anyone to find it in the Accademia dei Lincei. Furthermore,
the practice of printing only latinized versions of the names of scholars who contributed
conjectures over the ages causes grief to those who must surely imagine that these *docti
uiri* were contemporaries of Virgil when, in fact, they lived in Renaissance France. It
would take little extra time to clarify whether one means scholar x or his son and to
situate them in time by the dates of their publications. The aim of this prolegomenon is to
be accurate, user-friendly and to demystify the apparatus criticus as much as possible.

The thesis is divided into sections based on the evolving needs of the reader as he
or she grows more familiar with the topic. Each individual section has its own detailed
explanation but a brief overview now will be helpful. First, a history of the problem and
preparations for this thesis are discussed. Next, a catalogue of manuscripts follows so that
a scholar will have all the tools required to begin a personal study of the text. After that,
the variant readings are entered into special software which determines the relationship
between manuscripts. Those variant readings together with conjectures from rare and
modern editions become the basis for a new apparatus criticus. Finally, changes are made
to the text where necessary and explained in the commentary.
Chapter One: A Catalogue of Culex Manuscripts

Birger Munk Olsen is to be commended for the clarity of the entries in his catalogue of manuscripts. Following in his footsteps, at least with regard to form, I have broken each entry down into multiple parts. First, the reader learns the siglum by which the manuscript will be known in the apparatus criticus, then the city and library where the manuscript is held and its shelf-mark. The current shelf-marks have been prepared using Fitzgerald as a guide but other designations such as familiar names or former shelf-marks have not been neglected.29 If previous scholars assigned sigla to manuscripts, I have provided the scholar’s name and reused the sigla where possible. Any sigla of my own invention have also been duly noted. Other information follows such as the exact date or century in which it was written, its country of origin and ownership history if known, the folio numbers where the Culex appears and deviations from the standard amount of 414 lines if substantial. A reference from the catalogue of the manuscript’s home library rounds off each entry and is often accompanied by suggestions for further reading drawn from general catalogues or scholarly articles.

V = VATICAN CITY, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 2759

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.


**Culex:** 16v-18v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.


C = CAMBRIDGE, University Library

Kk.5.34

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** Clausen et al. 17.

**Date:** saec. ix or x Charles Hardwick, *A Catalogue of the Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1858)
703; saec. x Lord 196; saec. x Munk Olsen II (1985) 713. Michael Lapidge rejects such early dates on the basis of Anglo-Latin poems in the manuscript, one of which was not composed until at least 963. The result is that Kk.5.34 can be “no earlier than the late tenth century and perhaps even early eleventh.” See Michael Lapidge, “Three Latin Poems from Æthelwold’s School at Winchester,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 1 (1972): 95.

**Country of origin:** For the theory that the manuscript was copied at Hyde Abbey, Winchester in the late tenth century and remained there for a century or longer before moving to Glastonbury, see J. P. Carley, “Two Pre-Conquest Manuscripts from Glastonbury Abbey,” *Anglo-Saxon England* 16 (1987): 204-205, 210-211.\(^{30}\)

**Ownership:** John Moore (1646-1714) bishop of Norwich and Ely was the only documented owner of the manuscript and it passed from him to the Cambridge University Library.

**Culex:** The manuscript has one set of folio numbers by an unknown hand and a later group by Mr. Pink, former head of the manuscript department. Pink’s 84r-94v replaces the notation 20r-30v. Carley explains how Pink “began his foliation with the number 65, on the assumption that the now missing gatherings were all quires of eight.”\(^{31}\)

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** Hardwick 703-706; Munk Olsen II (1985) 712-713; Munk Olsen III, 2 (1989) 143; Lapidge 85, 94-95.

---

\(^{30}\) As a classicist used to the finding aids for my discipline, I was pleased to have the assistance of experts in mediaeval studies during my search for bibliography on various manuscripts. Miss Jayne Ringrose of Cambridge University Library brought this article to my attention and Mr. Dominique Poiriel kindly described the multitude of resources available to readers at the I.R.H.T.

\(^{31}\) Carley 205.
F = MELK, Stiftsbibliothek

717

**Familiar name:** For the designation cim. 2, see Clausen et al. 17 and Lord 196. The name “Viechtianus” was assigned by some scholars to a manuscript with characteristics surprisingly similar to those of Melk 717. Salvatore went so far as to include it in his edition alongside 717 as a separate entity. Concerning this error Courtney says, “Finally a ghost manuscript. On p. x of his Paravia text Salvatore among less important manuscripts of the Culex lists a Viechtianus saec. xi. As may be seen from his brief (and inaccurate) description of it, this is in fact his own F . . . Viecht and Fiecht are alternative names of its former home.”

**Former shelf-mark:** In the late nineteenth century, the manuscript was briefly known as codex 1863. After that, it became codex 1828 until 1936/1937. This information is available online. One can access Melk’s website and the sites of many other Austrian libraries through the website of the Kommission für Schrift- und Buchwesen des Mittelalters der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften [www.oeaw.ac.at/~ksbm/](http://www.oeaw.ac.at/~ksbm/).

Although many libraries now have websites, Melk’s site is extraordinary due to its bibliographical resources and search engines which allow searches by author, incipit etc.


---


**Siglum:** Clausen et al. 17.

**Date:** saec. x.

**Country of origin:** “Allemagne” Munk Olsen II (1985) 735.

**Ownership:** Codex 717 once belonged to the monastery of St. Georgenberg-Fiecht and was sold to Stift Melk in 1850. The sale was documented with these words, “Bibliothecae Mellicensi acquisitus est hic codex a. 1850.”

Pater Gottfried Glassner states that in the twentieth century the manuscript had a label which proclaimed that it was the property of the German empire but the monks removed it, fearing that the treasures of the library would be claimed by the Russians.

**Culex:** 223r-226r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** Lines 76-152, 204, 230-306 and 312 are missing.


E = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 8093

---

34 Glassner *Inventar* 299. I am indebted to Christine Glassner for providing me with .pdf files of her work and much assistance via e mail.
**Familiar name:** It is a witness to the *Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus.* Professor Clausen describes the lost *Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus* as “a Carolingian ‘edition’ inferior in integrity to the other MSS and much inferior to Γ, the latest and most obviously corrupt of them.”

Scholars once had five copies from which to reconstruct the original but that number is now growing. This matter will be discussed at greater length in the Adain section.

**Note on familiar names in old editions:** The manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and of some other libraries had a peculiar set of familiar names in works of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Authors tended to refer to manuscripts by the name of a former owner, by shape or by country of origin instead of by a shelf-mark.

Occasionally, they gave this other information in addition to the shelf-mark. The result is utter confusion. Besides the difficulty of the Latin and the length of these weighty tomes, one is faced with the unpleasant possibility that one may be missing more manuscripts than previously thought when, in fact, that is not the case. The best advice is to save any books earlier than the twentieth century until such time as one is convinced that all available manuscripts have been found and then to go back to the earlier authors and match manuscripts to descriptions. Our manuscript is “Colb. II n. 8093” i.e. Colbertinus in Heyne-Sillig 630.

**Former shelf-mark:** Concordances do exist for the old shelf-marks of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France but the only place where one is likely to see these numbers is on the manuscripts themselves. If the reader is not going to encounter them even in rare books, then there is little point in mentioning them.

---

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: parts from saec. ix, saec. x and saec. xiv Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum
bibliothecae regiae, Tomus Quartus (Parisiis [Paris]: ex typographica regia, 1744) 427;
saec. x Lord.

Country of origin: "Nord de la France" Munk Olsen II (1985) 761; "Lyon (?)" Bernhard
Bischoff, "Früharalingsche Handschriften und ihre Heimat," Scriptorium 22 (1968):
311.

Ownership: "olim Colbertinus" Catalogus IV (1744) 427. Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619-
1683) was a leading adviser to Louis XIV and a patron of the arts. He helped to establish
the first French national library on rue Vivienne, not far from the present home of the
manuscript department on rue Richelieu.

Culex: 60v-67v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Catalogus IV (1744) 427; Munk

A = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 7927

Familiar name: "Colb. I n. 7927" Heyne-Sillig 22, 627, 630. It is also a witness to the
Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus.

Former shelf-mark: I include it below only because it accompanied more important
information.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.
Date: saec. x. “nonnulla folia manu recentiore suppleta” Catalogus IV (1744) 413.


Culex: 1r-5r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Catalogus IV (1744) 413; Munk Olsen II (1985) 755-756.

W = TRIER, Stadtbibliothek

1086

Familiar name: “Augustanus” August Naeke, Carmina Valerii Catonis (Bonae [Bonn]: apud H. B. Koenig, 1847) 356-359. It is also a witness to the Juvenalis Ludi Libellus.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: saec. ix Gottfried Kentenich, Die philologischen Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek zu Trier (Trier: Selbstverlag der Stadtbibliothek, 1931) 14; saec. ix-x Lord 196.


Ownership: Folio 1r proclaimed, “Iste liber pertinet ad s. Mathiam, ut in ultimo inuenies folio.” On the last page, Matthias v. Saarburg, Canon of St. Simeon in Trier, wrote,
“Habui pro missali de sancto Mathia sed restituatur eidem monasterio.” This order was not carried out for later visitors saw the manuscript still at St. Simeon.\(^{36}\)

**Culex:** 170r-172r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.


\(^{36}\) Kentenich 15.

Culex: 99r-99v, 101r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: Lines 1-166 are lost. 167-248 are almost entirely illegible. 249-371 are just slightly cut off. For 372-414 only the beginnings of the lines remain.


Important note: This manuscript is in such poor condition that readings could only be deciphered in a few places. Silence seemed preferable to the endless repetition of legi non potuit S or omisit S. Therefore, if S is missing from many parts of the apparatus, one ought to assume that in those places there was nothing to gain by mentioning it.

B = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 3252
**Familiar name:** The manuscript is often called "Bebinus" after its former owners the illustrious Bembo family. It is also a witness to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*.

**Former shelf-mark:** B was Latin Manuscript 7 in Orsini’s inventory. His system of numbering his manuscripts was not continued once they became part of the Vatican Library. At the Vatican, an effort was made to arrange manuscripts according to subject matter and author.

**Siglum:** Clausen et al. 17.

**Date:** saec. ix Munk Olsen II (1985) 790; ix-x Vollmer (1908) 9; saec. x Pierre de Nolhac, *La bibliothèque de Fulvio Orsini* (Paris: F. Vieweg, 1887) 239.

**Country of origin:** “Probablement l’Allemagne” Munk Olsen II (1985) 789.

**Ownership:** Bernardo Bembo (1433-1519), the distinguished Venetian diplomat passed the manuscript to his even more famous son Pietro (1470-1547), the cardinal and author. In 1579, according to de Nolhac, Fulvio Orsini (1529-1600), librarian to three Farnese cardinals, acquired it from the unscrupulous Torquato Bembo, son of the late Pietro.\(^{37}\)

Torquato broke his promises to various collectors but, by employing some deception of his own, Orsini was able to add this work to his growing personal library. He bequeathed much of his collection to the Vatican Library.\(^{38}\)

**Culex:** 2v-8r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.

---

\(^{37}\) de Nolhac 97-98.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: *Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss.*


T = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 8069


**Former shelf-mark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** Clausen et al. 17.

**Date:** saec. xi


**Ownership:** “primum Jacobi Augusti Thuani, postea Colbertinus” *Catalogus IV* (1744) 424. Jacques Auguste de Thou (1553-1617) was a French historian and librarian of the Royal Library. See siglum E for more information on Colbert.

**Culex:** 114v-117v.
Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.


Γ = ROME, Biblioteca dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana

43 F 5

Familiar name: It is sometimes called the “Corsinianus” as it was once owned by the Corsini princes.

Former shelf-mark: Rossi 64

Siglum: Clausen et al. 17.

Date: As scholars were engaged in debating the date of the manuscript in various journals, the most recent official library catalogue by Petrucci appeared in which he proposed a date at the beginning of the fifteenth century. For his description, see Armando Petrucci, *Catalogo sommario dei manoscritti del fondo Rossi: Sezione Corsiniana* (Rome: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1977) 33. Professor Clausen listed it as saec. xiv in his 1966 edition. In 1976, Michael Reeve called into question the date agreed upon by the OCT editors saying, “Clausen and Goodyear indeed put it in the 14th century (p.17, 39) but as it contains a text of Calpurnius descended from the copy that Poggio sent to Florence from England, it cannot be earlier than 1418.” See Michael Reeve, “The Textual Tradition of the *Appendix Vergiliana,*” *Maia* 28 (1976): 238.

Professor Clausen consulted Reeve’s 1978 article and advises me that he accepts Reeve’s
hypothesis that the manuscript must be assigned to the 1420s. See Michael Reeve, "The Textual Tradition of Calpurnius and Nemesianus," *Classical Quarterly* 28 (1978): 237.

**Country of origin:** "Il codice sembra essere, con tutta probabilità, di origine fiorentina."

Petrucci 33; "Paduan origin" Reeve (1978) 237 and a similar statement in (1976) 237.

**Ownership:** Nicola Rossi (1711-1780) was administrative secretary to the Corsini family in Rome and lived in an apartment in the Palazzo Corsini. He built up a library which was separate from that of his employers. Upon his death, there was much wrangling over its sale. In 1786, it was sold to Bartolomeo Corsini and became part of the collection of the Biblioteca Corsiniana. In 1883, the Palazzo Corsini was bought by the Italian government as a new home for the Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. At the same time, Tommaso Corsini donated the entire contents of the Biblioteca Corsiniana to the Accademia. 40

**Culex:** 103r-108v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** Petrucci 33; Robinson Ellis, "A Roman MS of the *Culex*," *Journal of Philology* 16 (1888): 153-156 and by the same author, "The Corsini MS of the *Culex*," *Classical Review* 6 (1892) 203-205; Reeve (1978) 225, 235, 237.

\[\psi = \text{PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France}\]

---

39 Professor Clausen was very kind to share his new feelings on the manuscripts and the text with me and prevented me from falling into several errors.

40 More detailed information about Rossi and the Corsini family is available in Petrucci's introduction.
lat. 8207

**Familiar name:** “Colb. IV” Heyne-Sillig 630. It may be the “schedae Pithoei” in Scaliger’s edition.\(^{41}\)

**Former shelfmark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** Clausen et al. 17.

**Date:** parts from saec. xiii and saec. xiv *Catalogus* IV (1744) 437; saec. xiii Lord 196.

**Country of origin:** “una miscellanea non omogenea” Villa 402.

**Ownership:** “olim Colbertinus” *Catalogus* IV (1744) 437.

**Culex:** 6v-8r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** It only contains lines 1-94. Line 95 is from the *Georgics*, not the *Culex*. Referring to the large ratio of problems to verses, Michael Reeve wittily remarks, “The Parisinus should be compulsory reading for people who believe that manuscripts always transmit pretty much what the author wrote or that the 15\(^{th}\) century produced the worst interpolations.” See Reeve (1976) 247.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** *Catalogus* IV (1744) 437; Reeve (1976) 241, 247; Edward Kenney, “The Manuscript Tradition of Ovid’s *Amores, Ars Amatoria* and *Remedia Amoris*,” *Classical Quarterly* 12 (1962): 5; Sandys II (1997) 192, 199-203.

\(e = \text{EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo del Escorial}

Q.I.14

---

\(^{41}\) Scaliger (1573) 268.
**Familiar name:** This manuscript is a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum* along with other manuscripts listed below. My proposed changes to the group are presented in the Adain section.

**Former shelfmark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** Remo Giomini, *Appendix Vergiliana: testo, introduzione e traduzione* (Florence: “La Nuova Italia” Editrice, 1962). Let us say that the list of codices is on page four as they are on the fourth page after the Roman numerals.


**Country of origin:** “script French” Rosemary Burton, *Classical Poets in the Florilegium Gallicum* (Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1983) 52.

**The copies of the *Florilegium Gallicum***: According to Vollmer, Q.I.14 belongs to a group of French manuscripts which includes Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 7647; Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 17903; Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Diez. B Sant. 60 and London, British Library Harley 2745. By comparing them, he attempted to reconstruct (at least for the *Appendix Vergiliana*) the text of the twelfth-century *Florilegium Gallicum* which survived wholly or in fragmentary form in many copies. See Vollmer (1908) 17-18, 35-36. Ullman later added Arras, Bibliothèque Municipale 64 to this group. See B. L. Ullman, “Tibullus in the Mediaeval Florilegia,” *Classical Philology* 23 (1928): 130-131 and also “Classical Authors in Certain Mediaeval Florilegia,” *Classical Philology* 27 (1932): 1-2. Professor Clausen stated in an article that there were five manuscripts in Ullman’s description
when, in fact, there were six.\textsuperscript{42} In his OCT, he only examined Arras, El Escorial and the
two manuscripts from Paris but did not reveal whether he had shortened the list due to
time constraints or because he felt that some manuscripts did not belong together. The
only edition which lists six manuscripts is the relatively new \textit{Appendix Vergiliana} by
Armando Salvatore and others.\textsuperscript{43}

\textbf{The original \textit{Florilegium Gallicum}:} The original \textit{Florilegium Gallicum} is described by
Munk Olsen as being “un produit de la seconde moitié du XII\textsuperscript{e} siècle.” He observes that
the oldest witnesses to it seem to indicate an origin in northern France but that it is
difficult to pinpoint where it was copied.\textsuperscript{44} R. H. Rouse offers Orléans as a likely home
for the manuscript citing the fact that “the preeminence of Orléans as a school for the
study of the Latin classical authors is reiterated as a \textit{topos} or as reality by numerous late
twelfth- and early thirteenth-century writers.” He goes on to lament that “no medieval
booklist or library catalog survives for any monastic or collegiate institution in Orléans
through which we might form a picture of what was once there.” Although unable to
confirm his suspicions concerning the original, Rouse proves that the oldest surviving
copy of the \textit{Florilegium Gallicum}, Bibliothèque Nationale de France lat. 7647, has a link
to Orléans through its former owner Pierre Daniel. Rouse’s learned and thorough article
increases our knowledge of other manuscripts in the group and adds some new ones as
well, thus giving reason for optimism to those of us who seek to raise the number even

\textsuperscript{42} Clausen (1964) 120, 136 n. 3.

\textsuperscript{43} Armando Salvatore et al., \textit{Appendix Vergiliana} (Romae [Rome]: Typis
Officinae Polygraphicae, 1997) xxv. I did not have the opportunity to examine the Berlin
manuscript but hope to do so at a later date.

\textsuperscript{44} Munk Olsen (1979) 76.
higher. See R. H. Rouse, “Florilegia and Latin Classical Authors in Twelfth- and Thirteenth-Century Orléans,” Viator 10 (1979) 131-160. Suggested places of origin for the manuscript besides Orléans include Corbie, Saint-Amand, Cluny, Saint-Pons de Tomières or Lobbes. It is even possible that the source was an unnamed library whose inventaire has come down to us or that the compiler used multiple libraries or manuscripts which are now lost. For a helpful summary of all points of view, see the article by Munk Olsen (1979): 75-77 and its continuation “Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIIIe siècle,” Revue d’histoire des textes 10 (1980): 152.

Ownership: “Procede de la biblioteca del Conde-Duque de Olivares.” Antolín III (1913) 365. This may be Gaspar de Guzmán, Conde-Duque de Olivares (1587-1645). He was known to have been unusually attached to his titles of Count and Duke and refused to choose between them. The artist Velázquez painted at least two portraits of a member of this family between 1634 and 1638.

Culex: 95r-95v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 58-85, 89-100, 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341, 342 and 413-414.

Esc. = EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo del Escorial

f.I.19

**Familiar name:** It is a witness to the Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus.

**Former shelf-mark:** “Sign. ant. II.A.2.-II.L.104.” Rubio Fernandez 86.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** anno 1407.

**Country of origin:** “probably written at Milan” Michael Reeve quoting from comments of Dr. Albinia de la Mare. See Reeve (1976) 243.

**Ownership:** undetermined.

**Culex:** 215v-219v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** Antolín II (1911) 146-147; Rubio Fernandez 86-87.

---

r = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 17903

**Familiar name:** This manuscript and lat. 7647 are called “excerpta Parisinorum” by Baehrens in his Poetae latini minores II 15. It is also a witness to the Florilegium Gallicum.

**Former shelf-mark:** Notre-Dame 188.

**Siglum:** Giomini 4.
Date: “Le manuscrit aurait été utilisé par Vincent de Beauvais pour la rédaction de son Speculum historiale, avant 1244.” Charles Samaran and Robert Marichal, Catalogue des manuscrits en écriture latine portant des indications de date, de lieu ou de copiste, Tome III, Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds Latin (N° 8001 à 18613) (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1974) 719. For the view that the Florilegium Gallicum was almost entirely absorbed by Vincent of Beauvais in his Speculum Historiale, see Rouse 158.

Country of origin: “Provenienz wahrscheinlich Beauvais” Johannes Hamacher, Florilegium Gallicum: Prolegomena und Edition der Exzerpte von Petron bis Cicero, De oratore (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1975) 27. This theory proposed by Hamacher and others is disputed by Burton who does not interpret the fact that Antoine Loisel had manuscripts from Beauvais to mean that they were all from Beauvais.45

Ownership: According to Samaran and Marichal, Antoine Loisel owned the manuscript and his grandson Claude Joly donated it to Notre-Dame de Paris in 1680. See Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 719. On page 73 of his catalogue Delisle simply writes, “N.D.”

Culex: 72v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 58-85, 89-100, 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341, 342 and 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Delisle 73; Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 719; Vollmer (1908) 35; Ullman (1928) 128-174; Ullman (1932) 1-42; Clausen

45 Burton 51.
(1964) 119-138; Kenney (1962) 5; Gustav Meyncke, "Die Pariser Tibull-Excerpte,"


\[ a = ARRAS, \text{ Bibliothèque Municipale (also known as Mediatheque Municipale)} \]

64 As there seemed to be some confusion over the exact shelf-mark, I wrote to Mr. Pascal Rideau. I had often seen it used in conjunction with 65 and worried about a potential misunderstanding. He confirmed that 64 was current and correct by itself.

**Familiar name:** It is a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum*.

**Former shelf-mark:** 65

**Siglum:** Salvatore et al. (1997) xxv and Ullman (1932) 2.

**Date:** "saec. xiii ... daté erronément du xv\textsuperscript{e} s. par le catalogue général" Colette Jeudy and Yves-François Riou, *Les manuscrits classiques latins des bibliothèques publiques de France*, Tome I (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989) 79; "xv\textsuperscript{e} siècle" *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, Tome IV, *Arras-Avranches-Boulogne* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1872) 39; "saeculum = xiii" Thomas Phillipps, *Codices manuscripti in bibliotheca Sancti Vedasti apud Atrebatiam* (Paris: Imprimerie Pihan Delaforest, 1828) 6; "xv\textsuperscript{e} siècle" [no given name] Caron, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de la ville d'Arras* (Arras: A. Courtin, 1860) 64.\footnote{Some of these catalogues were not available in Arras but were found instead at the British Library.}

**Country of origin:** "nord de la France" Jeudy and Riou 91.

**Ownership:** On folio 1v, Jacques Arondel, canon of Arras Cathedral, donates this manuscript saying, "Hunc librum de flores philosophorum ergouit ecclesiae Atrebatensi
dominus Jacobus Arondelli ipsius ecclesiae canonicus, supplicans ut omnes in eo legentes
deum deuote exorent pro anima eius et benefactoribus suis.”

*Culex*: 65v–66r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** It only has lines 58-85, 89-100, 154,
148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341,
342 and 413-414.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** *Catalogue général IV* (1872) 39;
Philips 6; Caron 64; Jeudy 79; Ullman (1928) 128-174; Ullman (1932) 1-42; Clausen
182.

\[ p = \text{PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France} \]

lat. 7647

**Familiar name:** This manuscript and lat. 17903 are called “excerptorum Parisinorum” by
Baehrens in his *Poetae latini minores* II 15. It is also a witness to the *Florilegium
Gallicum*.

**Former shelfmark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** Giomini 4.

**Date:** saec. xiii *Catalogus* IV (1744) 381; saec. xii-xiii Munk Olsen II (1985) 753; saec.
xii² Rouse 136.

**Country of origin:** “Le nord de la France” Munk Olsen (1979) 77.

**Ownership:** Although the *Catalogus* does not record Pierre Daniel of Orléans as a
sixteenth-century owner, Rouse feels that he should be added because missing leaves
from 7647 which link Daniel to the manuscript have resurfaced in Leiden’s Voss. lat. Q. 2. As for the *Catalogus*, it states, “codex primum Jacobi Augusti Thuani, postea Colbertinus.” See *Catalogus* IV (1744) 381. Siglum T has more information on de Thou.

*Culex*: 112va-b.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** It only has lines 58-85, 89-100, 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341, 342 and 413-414.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** *Catalogus* IV (1744) 381; Munk Olsen II (1985) 753-754, 861-862 and by the same author (1979) 75-82; Kenney (1962) 5; Meyncke 369-392, 452-453.

**U = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana**

Urb. lat. 350

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** “Codex in antiquo indice urbin. n. 492 signatus” Cosimus Stornajolo, *Codices Vrbinates latini*, Tomus I *Codices 1-500* (Romae [Rome]: Typis Vaticanis, 1902) 322.

**Siglum:** Giomini 4.

**Date:** saec. xv. Michael Reeve believes that the date of the manuscript is fixed by the words “F<riderici> C<omitis> Vrbi.” In a footnote, he says that the manuscript was written before 1474 but does not tell us why that date is important or why the manuscript must have been completed by then. We need to know that Federico da Montefeltro was

47 Rouse 138.
made Duke of Urbino in 1474 by Pope Sixtus IV and that, according to Stornajolo, his
cloth-of-arms was added after the manuscript was finished. Reeve disavows footnote 29
the following year but he seems to imply that we should disregard the earlier part of the
note concerning placement of the manuscripts on shelves rather than this section. See
237 especially n. 29 and (1976) 246 n. 60. One official exhibition catalogue claims that
the manuscript was copied “between the years 1475 and 1482.” See Miniatures of the


Ownership: “codices a Friderico II Vrbini duce medio fere saec. xv ac deinceps collecti”

Praefatio of Stornajolo. Federico da Montefeltro (1422-1482) was a skilled military
leader who financed his library with the profits of war.

Culex: 186r-191v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Stornajolo I (1902) 322; Miniatures
26; Pellegrin II, 2 (1982) 561-562; Reeve (1975) 231-247; Reeve (1976) 233-251;

Vladimiro Zabughin, Vergilio nel Rinascimento italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso,
Volume Secondo (Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli, 1923) 388, 435 n. 161; Pierre Courcelle,
“La tradition antique dans les miniatures inédites d’un Virgile de Naples,” École

d = OXFORD, Bodleian Library

Auct. F.1.17
Familiar name: It is a witness to the Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: "written in the 1st half of the 14\textsuperscript{th} cent." Falconer Madan and H.H.E. Craster, A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library, Vol. II Part 1, (Collections received before 1660 and miscellaneous MSS. acquired during the first half of the 17\textsuperscript{th} Century), Nos. 1-3490 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922) 401.


Ownership: The ownership history is unknown but the manuscript was probably received by the library around 1607.

Culex: 39r-41v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.


\(\eta = \text{LONDON, British Library}\)

Harley 2745

Familiar name: It is a witness to the Florilegium Gallicum according to many scholars but the Adain program will later show how it is not as closely related to e, r, a, p, Tr. or Q as they are to each other, at least in so far as the Culex is concerned. It contains some of the same lines and was written during the same time period as other members of the
group yet η’s Culex readings show that it may belong with our Q2 rather than with the
others.

**Former shelfmark:** The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

**Siglum:** Salvatore (1957) ix.

**Date:** saec. xv Robert Nares et al., *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the

R. D. Williams and T. S. Pattie, *Virgil: His Poetry Through the Ages* (London: The
British Library, 1982) 140. Personal examination of the manuscript proves that Nares is
guilty of either a misprint or a mistake in judgement. See also Rouse under country of
origin.

**Country of origin:** The manuscript was written in France “s. xiii 3” according to Rouse
154.

**Ownership:** The Harley family figures prominently in this thesis. Before discussing the
ownership of this manuscript, let us sketch out briefly the history of the collectors and
how their manuscripts came into the public domain. Robert Harley (1661-1724) was a
prominent British politician with a keen interest in acquiring fine books. In 1711, he
became the first Earl of Oxford. Upon his death, his son Edward (1689-1741) continued
to increase the collection. In 1753, the Countess of Oxford and her daughter, the Duchess
of Portland, sold everything to the British government. This manuscript was purchased by
Edward Harley on August 13, 1724 from bookseller Nathaniel Noel (*floruit* 1681-circa
1753). See Cyril Wright, *Fontes Harleiani* (London: The Trustees of the British Museum,
1972) 254-255.

**Culex:** 85v.
Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 79, 80, 81 and 84.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Nares et al. II (1973) 710; Williams and Pattie 140.

h = LONDON, British Library

Harley 2534

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelfmark: The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: saec. xiii.

Country of origin: Dr. Justin Clegg, Curator of Manuscripts of the British Library, responded to my request for information saying, “Unfortunately, the catalogue entry for this particular volume provides little more than a description of its contents, and it does not seem to have been the subject of any detailed scholarly attention. However, a brief examination of the manuscript itself suggests that it is French, probably northern French, and that it dates from the early thirteenth century.”

Ownership: This manuscript and others belonged to the Jesuit College of Agen and then was purchased by the Harley family “but how and when the 70 MSS were acquired is perhaps the greatest puzzle of all.48 For information concerning Robert Harley and his heirs, please see siglum η.

Culex: 129r-129v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 1-94.

48 Wright xvi.
Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Nares et al. II (1973) 698; Wright xvi, 47; Williams and Pattie 132.

Voss. = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit

Voss. lat. O. 81

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: second half of saec. xv.


Ownership: Pierre-Michon Bourdelot (1610-1685) was Queen Christina of Sweden’s physician and the founder of a scientific academy. The manuscript passed from him to Queen Christina (1626-1689) who made history by abdicating and converting to Catholicism. Isaac Vossius (1618-1689), a Dutch professor, was her librarian and had a number of her manuscripts in his possession, perhaps without her consent. Upon his death, his nephew Gerardus Vossius received the manuscript and sold it along with many others to the Rijksuniversiteit in Leiden.⁴⁹

Culix: 15v-22v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial. 411 is the last verse.

Lines were ruled in after it but the scribe never completed his task.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: de Meyier III (1977) 139-142;

---

⁴⁹ I am grateful to Mr. John Cramer for helping me to locate the eighteenth-century catalogue of the Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit.
W. Senguerd et al., *Catalogus librorum tam impressorum quam manuscriptorum*

*Bibliothecae Vniversitatis Lugduno-Batauæ* (Lugduni apud Batauos [Leiden]:


I = LEIDEN, Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit

Voss. lat. F. 78

**Familiar name:** “Vossianus II n. 78” Naeke 369.

**Former shelf-mark:** not applicable.

**Sigilum:** my own invention.

**Date:** second half of saec. xv.


**Ownership:** It passed from Isaac Vossius to his nephew Gerardus Vossius and from him to the Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit in Leiden. For information on the Vossius family, see sigilum Voss.

**Culex:** 122v-128r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** de Meyier I (1973) 167-171, Senguerd et al. 374; Edouard Galletier, *Epigrammata et Priapea* (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1920) 75.

**Tr. = Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale**
2013

**Familiar name:** From the unusual order of the line numbers which this manuscript preserves, we may make a case that it is a witness to the *Florilegium Gallicum*. Later in the thesis, the Adain software will confirm this relationship by demonstrating how this manuscript shares a high number of readings with e, r, a and p.

**Former shelf-mark:** “Clairvaux, sans numéro” *Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements*, Tome Second (Paris: Imprimerie Impériale, 1855) 824. It is uncertain which catalogue the compiler of the *Catalogue général* was consulting. It is true that the manuscript does not appear in the catalogues of 1472 or 1521 and could lead one to conclude that it did not have a shelf-mark at Clairvaux. This is not the case according to Vernet who has found that 2013 once belonged to the “parua bibliotheca dormitorii” of Clairvaux. He studied a hand-written inventory of the small library (*circa* 1520) in a manuscript which is now Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale 1310. From this he deduced that 2013 was once 539 and could be tied to Clairvaux at least as far back as 1520. See André Vernet, *La Bibliothèque de l’Abbaye de Clairvaux* (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1979) 43, 618, 799.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** saec. xv.

**Country of origin:** If we accept Tr. as a member of the *Florilegium Gallicum*, then it must be of French origin. There is no way of determining where the manuscript was before 1520.

**Ownership:** The manuscript was at Clairvaux until the time of the French Revolution. When Dr. Jacques Hennequin, a professor at the Sorbonne, founded the
library of Troyes in 1651, the library had mostly printed books. The majority of the manuscripts came from religious organizations which had been suppressed with the chief source being Clairvaux.

_Culex_: 68v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** It only covers lines 79-85, 89-93, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294 and 413-414.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** _Catalogue général_ II (1855) 824-825.

**Wu. = WÜRZBURG, Universitätsbibliothek**

M.ch.f. 60

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** Parts of the manuscript are from saec. xiv and other parts are from saec. xv. The section which contains the _Culex_ is from saec. xiv. Hans Thurn, _Die Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Würzburg_, Fünfter Band, _Bestand bis zur Säkularisierung Erwerbungen und Zugänge bis 1803_ (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 1994) 17, 23.


**Ownership:** The manuscript bears the following inscription, "Nicolai Horn artium et medicine doctoris. Georgii Hutter nepotis, artium magistri et licentiati sacre theologie,
canonici ecclesie Onoltbacensis. Alles wohl von der Hand Hutters.” Georg Hutter was in charge of the Hornschen Spital in Dettelbach. He died in 1531 and his manuscripts passed to Nicolas Horn. In 1717, the collection came into the possession of Fürstbischof Johann Philipp II von Greiffenclau of Würzburg. Thurn 17, xi-xiv.

_Cutex_: 166r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** It only covers lines 413-414.


_Bnf._ = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

_lat._ 3343

**Familiar name:** This manuscript is a witness to the _Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus_. It also shares several readings with the _Florilegium Gallicum_ group. It is regrettable that _Bnf._ and some of the other excerpts are such small samples that one does not dare to categorize them with any degree of certainty. For more on the _Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus_ and _Florilegium Gallicum_, see the Adain results section.

**Former shelf-mark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

Country of origin: The manuscript is composed of various fragments which seem to be of French origin.

Ownership: Jacques Mentel, a Parisian scientist and contemporary of Colbert, is the only verifiable owner. The manuscript also bears a sixteenth-century signature of Jehan Petit, the associate of Josse Bade Ascensius.

Culex: 130r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 1-7 and 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Catalogus III (1744) 405;

Laur. = FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana

Plut. 33.31

Familiar name: This manuscript is sometimes referred to as the "Miscellanea Latina."\textsuperscript{50}

It is probably the most famous manuscript of the Culex as it was copied by Boccaccio. It is also a witness to the Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: Giomini 4.

Date: beginning of saec. xiv.

Country of origin: Italy.

Ownership: "in cuius primi folii summo margine legitur: Antonii Petrei et amicorum"

Angelus Maria Bandinius, Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Mediceae

Laurentianae, Tomus II (Florentiae [Florence], 1775) 128.

\textsuperscript{50} Lord 127.
Culix: 17r-24r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.


O = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Ottob. lat. 1374

Siglum: my own invention.

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: Cardinal Sirleto referred to the manuscript as either 64 or human. 66. Pellegrin I (1975) 542.

Date: saec. xvi.


Ownership: Cardinal Guglielmo Sirleto (1514-1585) was a contemporary of Pope Gregory XIII and instrumental in the implementation of the Gregorian Calendar. Other owners included Giovanni Angelo duc d’Altemps and Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni (1667-1740), nephew of Pope Alexander VIII.

Culix: 72v-73r.
Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers verses 5 (second half), 6, 7, 225, 226, 227 (first half), 413 and 414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Inuentarii codicum manuscriptorum latinorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae Ottobonianae, Pars I. (no pagination); Pellegrin I (1975) 541-542.

J = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 1576

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: end of saec. xiv.


Ownership: Angelo Colocci (died 1549) was a wealthy patron of the humanities who had a printing press in his house. According to Pellegrin, he was also bishop of Nocera Umbra. Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 146.

Culex: 1v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

K = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Reg. lat. 1671

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** The manuscript was shelf-mark 1655 in Queen Christina of Sweden’s collection. Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 354.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** second half of saec. x.

**Country of origin:** “anglaise, probablement Worcester” Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 353.

**Ownership:** Pellegrin lists several owners whose names cannot be deciphered but we are able to trace the manuscript down through the Petau family to Queen Christina of Sweden. Sandys recounts how Isaac Vossius obtained on Christina’s behalf the library of Alexander Petavius (Alexandre Petau, died 1672). He, in turn, had received it from Paul Petau (1568-1614). For more on Christina and the Vossius family, see siglum Voss.

**Culex:** 218v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** It only covers lines 413-414.


---

M = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Ottob. lat. 1412

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

---

**Former shelf-mark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** saec. xii with additions from saec. xiii-xv.

**Country of origin:** “italienne” Pellegrin I (1975) 554.

**Ownership:** The owners were Giovanni Angelo duc d’Altemps and Cardinal Pietro Ottoboni. For more on Cardinal Ottoboni, see siglum O.

**Culex:** 140v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** It only covers lines 413-414.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** *Inuentarii codicum manusciptorum latinorum Bibliothecae Vaticanae Ottoboniana* I (no pagination); Pellegrin I (1975) 552-555.

---

N = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Ross. 503

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** “saec. xiii fol 1-88, saec. xv reliqua” *Bibliotheca Rossiana* 292; saec. xii Munk Olsen II (1985) 784.

**Country of origin:** “italienne, probablement pour les deux parties du manuscrit”


**Ownership:** “aucune indication” Pellegrin II, 2 (1982) 452. Although there is no mention of the Rossi family in the manuscript, we do possess some information concerning their
history. Gianfrancesco de Rossi married a wealthy widow in 1838, amassed a fine collection of manuscripts and printed books and died in 1854. His widow donated the library to the Jesuits and they kept the books in Austria for some time before finally depositing them in the Vatican in 1855. For more information on the Bibliotheca Rossiana, see Jeanne Bignami-Odier, "Guide au département des manuscrits de la bibliothèque du Vatican," École française de Rome: Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire 51 (1934): 226-227.

*Culex*: 24r. An old folio number of 39r is at the top of the page in the centre.

*Deviation from the standard amount of lines*: It only covers lines 413-414.


Q = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Reg. lat. 2120

*Familiar name*: Q is a witness to the Florilegium Gallicum.

*Former shelf-mark*: The manuscript once belonged to the Abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris and was known as KKK 8 in a catalogue of 1514. Elisabeth Pellegrin has discovered that parts of it are now in the Vatican Library, Bern and Paris. These unfortunate membra disiecta have been bound with other items and now carry shelf-marks Reg. lat 2120, Bern 327 and Paris lat. 15155. For a complete analysis, see Elisabeth Pellegrin, "Manuscrits de l'abbaye de Saint-Victor et d'anciens collèges de Paris à la Bibliothèque Municipale de Berne, à la Bibliothèque Vaticane et à Paris,"
Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes 103 (1942): 96. Several authors claim that it also bore shelf-mark 756 at Saint-Victor.

Siglum: my own invention.


Country of origin: “française . . . peut-être écrit à l'abbaye de Saint-Victor de Paris” Pellegrin II, l (1978) 517; “While MS 15155 had come to rest at Saint-Victor by the fifteenth century, it did not originate there; for in the fourteenth century it was sold to a Rouen master by one Henri François of Orléans.” Rouse 155.

Ownership: Pellegrin, in the above-mentioned reference from 1978, has determined the ownership history for the first part of the manuscript which does not contain the Culex. She is reluctant to assign the second part to the same owners and leaves the matter open. Pierre Daniel of Orléans (1530-1603), the jurist and man of letters, passed the manuscript to author Jacobus Revius of Deventer [Jakob Reesjen] (1586-1658). The next owner, scholar Nicolaas Heinsius of Leiden (1620-1681), was known for his edition of Virgil. Queen Christina of Sweden is the last verifiable owner. After her death, the manuscript became part of the Vatican Library collection which bears her name. The reader will find more on Christina and her Dutch connections under siglum Voss.

Culex: The Culex appears twice in this manuscript. I have given the siglum Q to the lines on fol. 66r-66v and Q2 to the lines on 55r. This is an old foliation which is no longer valid because so many leaves are now missing. For 66r-66v, read 23r-23v and for 55r, read 12r. The double presence of the Culex was first noticed by Robathan in her article. See Dorothy Robathan, “The Missing Folios of the Paris Florilegium 15155,” Classical Philology 33 (1938): 188-197.
Deviation from the standard amount of lines: Q only covers lines 79-82, 294, 342 and 414. Q2 has lines 79-82.


X = LONDON, British Library

Harley 3963

Familiar name: “Anglicanus” Naeke 346. It is also a witness to the Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus.

Former shelfmark: The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: “seconda metà del sec. xv” Tammaro de Marinis, La legatura artistica in Italia nei secoli XV e XVI, Volume II (Florence: Fratelli Alinari, Istituto di Edizione Artistiche, 1960) 79.

Country of origin: Michael Reeve assigns the manuscript to Padua. See Reeve (1978) 237. De Marinis, in the continuation of the above-mentioned reference, argues for Venetian origin based on “iniziali miniate di scuola veneta.”

Ownership: For more on Robert and Edward Harley, see siglum η. We cannot determine from the catalogue or from Wright’s book which Harley purchased the manuscript.

Culex: 254r-261v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Nares et al. III (1973) 99; Williams

I = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Reg. lat. 1719

Familiar name: For quite some time scholars bemoaned the loss of a “Petauianus” manuscript which earlier editors often cited. Reeve identifies I as the Petauianus on the basis of readings listed by Ribbeck and by knowledge of its former owners. He also adds manuscripts I and d to the WBEAT group. See Reeve (1976) 242. In the Adain section, it will be possible to test his theories. I is a witness to the Juvenalis Ludi Libellus.

Former shelf-mark: The manuscript bears shelf-mark M. 31 from Paul Petau’s library on f.1. Pellegrin II, 1 (1978) 392.


Date: saec. x-xi.


Ownership: For Paul Petau, Alexandre Petau and Queen Christina of Sweden, see sigla K and Voss.

Culex: 16v-23v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.


Y = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit

Voss. lat. O. 96

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: “saec. xv²” de Meyier III (1977) 182.


Ownership: Y passed from Isaac Vossius to his nephew Gerardus Vossius and finally to Leiden’s Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit. A typed description inside the manuscript reads, “Keine Namen von früheren Besitzern; wo und wann Is. Vossius den Codex erwarb, ist unbekannt.” For more on the Vossius family, see siglum Voss.

Culex: 19r-30v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: de Meyier III (1977) 182-186;

Senguerd et al. 390; Plérient (1910) 21.

Bpl. = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit

B.P.L. 35

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.
**Siglum:** my own invention.


**Country of origin:** “Italie?” Munk Olsen II (1985) 725.

**Ownership:** “Codex olim uidetur fuisse J. de Mully cuius nomen est scriptum in marg. fol. 2; postea ‘Iani Rutgersii’ (f.1).” Janus Rutgersius (1589-1625), the uncle of Nicolaas Heinsius, was a Dutch scholar who worked in the Swedish diplomatic service.

**Culex:** 181r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** It only covers line 413.


**Ha. =** LONDON, British Library

Harley 2701

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** The words “Anno Domini Millesimo quadringentesimo quadragesimo septimo” [i.e. 1447] were written on folio 276v. This is also the reading in Nares et al. II (1973)

**Country of origin:** The manuscript was copied in Italy as proven by "Roma" on 276v.

**Ownership:** Humfrey Wanley wrote on folio 1v, "Hic Codex olim fuit Aldi Manutii." This is disputed by Watson and Wright who see no authority for the claim. See Watson 127 and Wright 233. If we look to the Adain program for help, it does not tell us conclusively that Aldus Manutius or his heirs used Ha. It does tell us that they were familiar with a manuscript in the V.Voss.Ha. group. We shall look at specific examples later in the Adain section. Wright believes that a G. Baruffaldi or Barraffaldi owned the manuscript in the seventeenth century followed by Andrew Hay (died 1754), a dealer in various antiques. Hay sold 2701 to Edward Harley on July 13, 1723. See Wright 182-183. For the history of the Harley family, see siglum η.

**Culex:** 300v-309r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** Nares et al. II (1973) 708; Williams and Pattie 133; Watson 127.

Z = LONDON, British Library

Burney 273

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** The manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

**Siglum:** my own invention.


Ownership: The Reverend Charles Burney (1757-1817) was a classical scholar and schoolmaster. His manuscripts, books and prints were deposited in the British Museum in 1818. See *Index of Manuscripts in the British Library*, Volume II (Cambridge: Chadwyck-Healey, 1984) 209.

Culex: 115r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Forshall Preface, 69; Williams and Pattie 130; Munk Olsen II (1985) 730; *Index* 209.

Fr. = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France

lat. 8205

Familiar name: "Colbertinus III" Heyne-Sillig 630; "Parisinus IV" Naeke 345. It is also a witness to the *Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus*.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Sigillum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xv *Catalogus IV* (1744) 437; "fin du xvè siècle" Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 726.

Country of origin: The copyist Iacobus Raguirer signed his name on folio 26v, thus indicating French origin. Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 726.
Ownership: “olin Colbertinus” Catalogus IV (1744) 437. For more information about Colbert, see siglum E.

Culex: 38r-45v.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Catalogus IV (1744) 437; Samaran and Marichal III (1974) 726; Lord 141; Piésent (1910) 15-16.

Pom. = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 3255

Familiar name: not applicable

Former shelf-mark: Pom. was Latin Manuscript 154 in Fulvio Orsini’s library.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xv.

Country of origin: This Italian manuscript is attributed to Pomponio Leto (1428-1498) in the Vatican catalogue with these inscriptions, “Virgilii Georgica cum scholiis Pomponii Laeti” . . . eiusdem Culex cum scholiis eiusdem . . . est scriptus a Pomponio Laeto.”52 Nolhac places it in his chapter entitled “Autographes de Pomponius Laetus.” Hunt and his colleagues reject Pomponius as the copyist. In their opinion, “Zabughin’s claim that glosses in two Vatican manuscripts of Vergil are partly in Pomponio’s hand has now been disproved, although it is true that the glosses in . . . Vat. lat. 3255 derive

from his lectures.”\textsuperscript{53} Lunelli’s view that “il Vat. lat. 3255 . . . e scritto da discepoli” is now the prevailing one.\textsuperscript{54}

**Ownership:** For information on Fulvio Orsini, see siglum B.

**Culex:** 47v-56r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.


**Cor.** = VENICE, Museo Correr

Cicogna 886

**Former shelf-marks:** “precedenti segnature: Cicogna 353; Ms. Classe VI. 216” (from the letter of the director, Professor Giandomenico Romanelli).

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** According to Professor Romanelli, the correct description is “manoscritto cartaceo del sec. XV (seconda metà) o XVI (prima metà)” but he also has in his possession the *Catalogo della biblioteca di Emmanuele Cicogna di Venezia* [v. 1:] *Codici manoscritti*

\textsuperscript{53} Hunt et al. 11-12.

dal numero I al mille inclusivamente, Venezia, compiuto nell'ottobre del 1841 which
gives a date of "secolo XIV."

Country of origin: Mr. Piero Lucci reports that nothing is known about this manuscript's
country of origin.

Ownership: "Dono del co.[nte] Lodovico Rota di S. Vito [al Tagliamento, provincia di
Pordenone]; spettava alla Libreria del celebre friulano Giandomenico Bertoli (1676-
1763); suo ultimo possedere privato (nel sec. XIX), l'erudito veneziano E. A. Cigona
(1789-1868) che ha scritto il suo nome sul margine alto di c.I con la data: "Ven.[ezia]
1831" dal quale il manoscritto è pervenuto alla Biblioteca insieme a ricchissime
collezioni artistiche e documentarie" (Professor Romanelli). I have discovered a Cavalier
Lodovico Rota (1579-1630) whose book Il re Gernando, tragedia was published in
Venice in 1624. The time-period is possible but the identification is far from certain.

Culex: The date was not the only problem in this manuscript. The pagination also
necessitated correspondence with library staff. Fearing that I had actually missed some
lines of the Culex during my visit, I wrote to Mr. Piero Lucci who responded, "Dopo aver
esaminato il manoscritto credo di capire il suo dubbio, il testo del Culex che lei conosce è
alla carta ora indicata "c.IIr", già carta di guardia posteriore, come dalla precedente
descrizione (e secondo una precedente numerazione errata scritta a matita in alto a destra
-e ora corretta- che forse lei legge nel microfilm: "c. 83r"). Si tratta dunque di una sola
copia."

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413-414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: I was unable to consult the above-
mentioned catalogue for this manuscript but was fortunate enough to have the assistance
of the two kind gentlemen. It is rather amusing that this excerpt required more work than 
any of its longer cousins!

Amb. = MILAN, Biblioteca Ambrosiana

H 178 inf.

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xiii Maria Luisa Gengaro and Gemma Villa Guglielmetti, Inventario dei 
codici decorati e miniati (secc. VII-XIII) della Biblioteca Ambrosiana (Florence: Leo S. 


Ownership: “Provenienza non indicata” Gengaro and Villa Guglielmetti 105.

Culex: 117r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: It only covers lines 413–414.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Antonio Ceruti, Inventario Ceruti dei 
Gengaro and Villa Guglielmetti 105; Munk Olsen (1985) 736.

Vat. = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. lat. 1586

Familiar name: It is a witness to the Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.
Siglum: my own invention.

Date: saec. xv.


Ownership: "Minias Pucci de Florence, fils d'Antonio d'après l'ex-libris du f. 1v" Pellegrin III, 1 (1991) 165. For more on Bishop Angelo Colocci of Nocera Umbra, see siglum J.

Culex: 57r-64r.

Deviation from the standard amount of lines: not substantial.


Pie. = NEW YORK, Pierpont Morgan Library

M. 223

Familiar name: not applicable.

Former shelf-mark: not applicable.

Siglum: my own invention.

Date: anno 1455.


Ownership: It passed from Ambroise Firmin-Didot (1790-1876) to D. Morgand in 1878. Later it belonged to John Pierpont Morgan (1837-1913) and to his son of the same name (1867-1943).
*Culex*: 62v-69v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines**: not substantial.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading**: de Ricci 1408.

**Vl. = VIENNA, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek**

3230

**Familiar name**: not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark**: “φ. 265.” Stephanus Endlicher, *Catalogus codicum philologicorum latinorum Bibliothecae Palatinae Vindobonensis* (Vindobonae [Vienna]: apud F. Beck, 1836) 65. It is also given as “Philol. 265.” in *Tabulae codicum manuscriptorum praeter graecos et orientales in Bibliotheca Palatina Vindobonensi asservatorum*, Volumen II (Vindobonae [Vienna]: Caroli Geroldi Filius, 1868) 239.

**Siglum**: my own invention.

**Date**: saec. xvi.

**Country of origin**: “Volumen totum a ludimagistro Viennensi ineuntis saeculi xv congestum fuisse uidetur.” Endlicher 66.

**Ownership**: no indication.

**Culex**: 158v-166v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines**: not substantial.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading**: Endlicher 65-66; *Tabulae codicum* II (1868) 239; Plévent (1910) 20-21.

**Vla. = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana**
Vat. lat. 7192

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** saec. xv-xvi.

**Country of origin:** The manuscript is composed of various poems which appear to be of Italian origin.

**Ownership:** no indication.

**Culex:** 339v-345v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** It only contains lines 1-7, 78-234, then 8-77.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** *Inuentarium librorum latinorum Mss.*


---

**Add. = LONDON,** British Library

Add. 16562

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelfmark:** This manuscript was once kept in the British Museum.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** Watson rejects this manuscript from his catalogue of datable manuscripts although Ad. has two indications of date. At first, this seems to be a strange course of action but his reasons are clear. “On fol. 16 the final part of the year has been neatly erased, leaving only ‘M’cccc’ < . . . >’. A slip of paper pasted to fol. 1, a flyleaf, bears several post-
mediaeval numbers and 'Anno 1460'. This date may be correct but it may be no more than an approximation." See Watson 165.

**Country of origin:** “Written in Italy” Williams and Pattie 128.

**Ownership:** no indication.

**Culex:** 62v-69v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** Catalogue of Additions to the Manuscripts in the British Museum in the Years 1846-1847 (London: British Museum, 1864) 278-279; Williams and Pattie 128; Watson Introduction 165.

Cl. = VENICE, Museo Correr

Cicogna 1775

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** “precedente segnatura: Cicogna 954” (from the letter of Professor Romanelli).

**Sigillum:** my own invention.

**Date:** “Ms. del sec. XIX” (Professor Romanelli).

**Country of origin:** Venice, Italy.

**Ownership:** “Sul primo foglio del volume, titolo: Miscellanea di scritti di vari autori; sulla carta di guardia: ‘Codice raccolto e scritto di pugno di Francesco Negri letterato veneziano = lasciato in testamento a me Emm.[anuele] Cicogna di Venezia con altri simili’ come il ms. precedente Cicogna 1774 che contiene ‘pezzi da lui copiati da vari mss. e libri stampati’” (Professor Romanelli).
Culex: 41r-48r.

Deviation from the standard amount is: not substantial.

Catalogues and suggestions for further reading: Professor Romanelli again quotes from the Catalogo della biblioteca di Emmanuele Cicogna di Venezia [v. 1:] Codici manoscritti dal numero I al mille inclusivamente, Venezia, compiuto nell’ottobre del 1841. He assures me that on page 412 it states, “Il Culex è descritto con le stesse parole che compaiono nel testo: ‘4. Publìi Vergilii Maronis Culex, cum adnotationibus ex Petri Bembi libello depromptis.’”

Important note: This manuscript is almost an exact copy of Pietro Bembo’s 1530 edition of the Culex. That fact makes it useless for any future stemma but it does have some redeeming features. The copyist is checking his work against some other manuscript(s) or printed book(s) and although guilty of contaminatio, he provides us with some interesting readings. As Bembo’s work is a printed book, I do not give the collation in full as I would if it were a manuscript. In most cases, I only mention it when it is the first to offer a certain reading or one of few editions to do so, but when Ci. disagrees with Bembo, I shall present both readings.

Onb. = VIENNA, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek

3108

Familiar name: not applicable.

55 Pietro Bembo, Petri Bembi ad Herculem Strotium de Virgilii Culice et Terentii fabulis liber. Venetiis [Venice], per loan. Ant. eiusque frатres de Sabio, 1530.

**Siglum:** my own invention.

**Date:** “Arbeit der zweiten Hälfte des XV. Jahrhunderts” Hermann Julius Hermann, *Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich* (Leipzig: Karl W. Hiersemann, 1930) 47.


**Ownership:** “In fronte codicis notatur possessoris nomen: ‘1544 Rudbertus Niuimontanus est possessor huius libri, datum a Iacobolo Limitanio.’” Endlicher 64.

Hermann notes that the manuscript also belonged to the Wiener Jesuitskollegiums until 1773 when it passed to the Hofbibliothek. See Hermann 47.

**Culex:** 221v-227v.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not substantial.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** Endlicher 63-64; *Tabulae codicum* II (1868) 198; Hermann 47-48; Unterkircher 91.

There is one final manuscript to add to the list which does not have a siglum assigned to it. This is because Canon. Class. Lat. 54 does not have enough of a text of the *Culex* to be of assistance to us in the apparatus criticus. Instead, it has a set of glosses by

---

56 The same reference reveals that “Niuimontanus” indicates an inhabitant of the town of Schneeberg.
Pomponio Leto on the complete works of Virgil including the *Appendix Vergiliana*. According to *The Survival of Ancient Literature*, “The manuscript is not autograph, as Zabughin thought, but a fair copy by a scribe. However, there is at least one added note in Pomponio’s hand (fol. 142v).”\(^{57}\) The commentary on the *Culex* is almost identical to the text printed by Giovanni Oporin in his Basel edition of 1544 but on certain topics the information is more complete than that provided by Oporin. Pomponio never published his glosses yet they appear in different stages of completion, copied by his own hand or by others on manuscripts, pirated by Daniel Gaitano, reworked by Oporin and reprinted in many subsequent editions.

**OXFORD, Bodleian Library**

Canon. Class. Lat. 54

**Familiar name:** not applicable.

**Former shelf-mark:** not applicable.

**Siglum:** not applicable.

**Date:** “last third of the 15\(^{th}\) cent.” Hunt et al.15.

**Country of origin:** Italy.

**Ownership:** On folio 1r one can read the word “est” which has been changed to “erat”, then the names “Io. Rutini et amicorum” and on the next line “Benedicti Varicensii.” In the opinion of Hunt and his colleagues, the 2 ex-libris date from the sixteenth century.

and the second is "perhaps identifiable as Benedetto Varchi, 1503-65, the Florentine historian."\(^{58}\) The most famous owner of the manuscript was Matteo Luigi Canonici (1727-1805) who gave his name to a Bodleian collection of manuscripts. He was born in Venice and became a Jesuit in 1743. After the suppression of the Jesuit order, the Summary Catalogue reports that "he set himself to study history, and collected coins, statuary, printed books and manuscripts. Canonici’s collections passed to his brother Giuseppe, and on [Giuseppe’s] death in 1807 to Giovanni Perissinotti and Girolamo Cardina who divided them. To the former fell the manuscripts, then about 3550 in number, and, after many attempts to sell them, the Bodleian became the purchaser of the greater part in 1817."\(^{59}\)

*Culex*: 1r-12r.

**Deviation from the standard amount of lines:** not applicable.

**Catalogues and suggestions for further reading:** Madan IV (1897) 318 (simply refers the reader to Coxe’s catalogue); Henricus [Henry] Coxe, *Catalogi codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae*, Pars Tertia, *Codices graecos et latinos Canonicianos complectens* (Oxonii [Oxford]: e typographeo academico, 1854) 133-134. The Bodleian library website [www.bodley.ac.uk](http://www.bodley.ac.uk) is useful for information which cannot be found in the catalogues, such as the date of Canonici’s death.

\(^{58}\) Hunt et al. 166.

Chapter Two: The Adain Program and the Relationship Between Manuscripts

As I was in the process of gathering the fifty manuscripts chosen for this study, I reviewed some scholarly articles in order to see how successful others were in making their observations on the interconnection of manuscripts clear to readers who did not have the source material in front of them. I intentionally omitted articles which dealt with my subject until after I had collated the manuscripts and jotted down any links which appeared. The authors all produced compelling evidence by quoting readings which proved that x and y came from different branches of the stemma. Often measurements and line counts per page were included as well as learned discussions of the life and library of the former owner. I had no fault to find with their results but, at the same time, I wished that I had been given a diagram other than a stemma to help me visualize the argument. There was no problem in cases where the author only described a small number of manuscripts but I shuddered at the thought of presenting fifty.

I searched for suitable software but soon realized that Excel, while useful for the neat appearance of the finished product, would not perform the necessary calculation of affinity. My mathematical and programming skills were not sufficient to create something made to measure and were already being tested to the limit by Dr. Stefan Hagel's brilliant but challenging apparatus criticus program. Fortunately, a solution in the form of a freeware program named Adain was available at the following website:


First of all, it should be noted that all documentation for this program is in French, including command prompts. The first page of the help file warns the reader that we must not put too much trust in machines lest we forget that we are dealing with the copying
errors of human beings. The program's creator offers it with this purpose in mind, "aider quiconque veut étudier un appareil critique, en lui fournissant des moyens propres à vérifier rapidement les hypothèses qu'il peut formuler, en lui permettant de choisir aisément les exemples les plus probants pour sa démonstration." The user obtains three benefits from Adain. It permits him or her to determine the likelihood of a manuscript belonging to a given family and produces results in an easy-to-read chart. It creates a framework for asking questions about the agreement or opposition of individual manuscripts and allows quick retrieval of results which bolster the scholar's claim. Finally, these results can be downloaded to a .txt file and then printed from Word. I find that this works adequately for small files but larger ones require Excel as well as some surgery on the margins.

It soon became apparent that Professor Pierre-Louis Malosse did not have my thesis in mind when he wrote the program. He quite correctly notes that editors should only need a small number of slots for manuscripts in the program if they have done their work properly and excluded those which add nothing to the stemma. A prolegomenon, unfortunately, reflects the stage before the pruning and, like a sprawling rosebush, my fifty manuscripts were not pleased to be confined to the one hundred allotted spots. After all, what was one to do about correcting hands?

Before I describe the modifications which I made to the program, I should give a general account of what the user is expected to do in order to produce the desired results. The first task is to assign sigla to all manuscripts. This is necessary for the opening line of the apparatus's text file which the computer will read. One cannot simply cut the

---

60 First page of the file entitled Présentation.
apparatus which one has created in Dr. Hagel’s program and paste it into Adain. There
are specific lines of code which must be included and certain rules observed. I shall not
bore the reader with all the details but shall select those which affected my results and
would lead to confusion if left unexplained. Right from the start, I noticed a problem with
some of the sigla which I had taken such pains to find in the works of other scholars and
reuse in my own. The program refused to accept Greek characters and would not
differentiate between uppercase and lowercase versions of the same letter. It was
undesirable and far too late to select different sigla for my apparatus, so I did the next
best thing by changing the offending sigla slightly. An additional legend was created as a
concordance of old and new sigla.

Once the sigla have been established, one has to make a decision about correcting
hands. At first, I had them listed as separate manuscripts for the purposes of the program
but this used up too many slots and slowed the computer’s progress to a crawl. I then
devised a method which allowed me to mark other hands with *2, *3 etc. while only
using fifty slots. After this initial set of codes, I typed in my apparatus. I opened a new
window in Dr. Hagel’s program underneath the one which contained my apparatus so I
could paste sigla into both windows at the same time. Let us look at some introductory
material and then explain how the program turned code into charts and what the results
show.
Table 1: Legend of Sigla Used in the Adain File

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V = unchanged</th>
<th>d = unchanged</th>
<th>Y = unchanged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C = unchanged</td>
<td>η = eta.</td>
<td>Bpl. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F = unchanged</td>
<td>h = Sh$</td>
<td>Ha. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E = unchanged</td>
<td>Voss. = unchanged</td>
<td>Z = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A = unchanged</td>
<td>l = unchanged</td>
<td>Fr. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W = unchanged</td>
<td>Tr. = unchanged</td>
<td>Pom. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S = unchanged</td>
<td>Wu. = unchanged</td>
<td>Cor. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B = unchanged</td>
<td>Bnf. = unchanged</td>
<td>Amb. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T = unchanged</td>
<td>Laur. = unchanged</td>
<td>Vat. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γ = G</td>
<td>O = unchanged</td>
<td>Pie. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ = P</td>
<td>J = unchanged</td>
<td>Vi. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e = Se$</td>
<td>K = unchanged</td>
<td>Vla. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esc. = unchanged</td>
<td>M = unchanged</td>
<td>Ad. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = unchanged</td>
<td>N = unchanged</td>
<td>Ci. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a = +a+</td>
<td>Q = unchanged</td>
<td>Onb. = unchanged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p = -p-</td>
<td>X = unchanged</td>
<td>H = Professor Clausen's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U = unchanged</td>
<td>I = %I%</td>
<td>OCT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As previously stated, Canon. Class. Lat. 54 will not be included in this section.

Printed books have had the first "1" of their year of publication removed in order to save space in the lines of code.
Table 2: Sample Page of Adain Code

```adain


#pc=*2, *3, *4

>1 lusimus

>1 /H/ gracili modulante /Onb./

>1 thalia

>2 orsum

>3 /H/ hacpropter /573.*2/

>3 /H/ culici /F/ legi non potuit A

>3 sint
/HVFEBWTGEsc.U*2dShSVoss.Bnf.Laur.X%I%Ha.Fr.Vat.Ci.469.479.517.530.534 ./ sunt

>3 docta /HCFEAWBTGEsc.dLaur.*2%I%/ dicta


>4 per ludum

>4 consonet
```
The reader will notice numbers on the code page which, clearly, are not manuscripts. It seemed like a good idea to include rare books from the hundred years after the first printed Virgil. The enormous extra work of collation had to be weighed against the possibility of making comparisons between late manuscripts and early printed books. Once the decision was made, the program was modified slightly and the printed books were treated exactly like manuscripts.

The program works, essentially, by grouping readings into two categories, those which agree with the lemma and those which do not. Thus, I had to choose a set of readings to represent the lemma. As my apparatus used Professor Clausen’s OCT as a starting point, it seemed natural to use it here as well. It is possible to force the program to accept the negative method of textual criticism but I would not recommend it. The OCT of the Culex is the ubiquitous siglum H (for Harvard) at the left of each entry. Once all the code is in place, Adain races through it and crashes suddenly and without warning whenever it discovers a missing forward slash or period. The corrections last for hours until the software is satisfied.

Finally, with great fanfare, it announces that it has finished reading the file and offers to create a “tableau de coefficients de proximité” or to perform various operations on the manuscripts. If one opts for a chart and selects the manuscripts to be compared, the fifty-four pages of code transform themselves into a chart which fills one screen. One can look at H and discover which manuscripts were the most helpful to Professor Clausen.61 To the right of H are numbers in descending order which correspond to manuscripts.

---

61 This needs to be done in conjunction with his sigla as there are a few manuscripts on my list which would perhaps have been useful for him but were not in his edition.
Adain has arrived at these numbers by a mathematical calculation which gives more weight to incorrect readings than correct ones and more weight to uncommon readings than common ones. It does this on the grounds that manuscripts are usually assumed to present correct readings or to share an error with many others. A higher number means a higher chance that the manuscripts are related. One reads from left to right until the values dip significantly, usually after about five manuscripts.

The problem is that we are not always comparing apples with apples. Some of my manuscripts are excerpts with more decoration than words. If a fragment has even one reading in common with another manuscript, a disproportionately high number will emerge. How does one combat this phenomenon? The program does allow a “nombre minimum de lieux” to be set but in a large collection of manuscripts this is not feasible. The manuscripts must be divided into a “Short” group and a “Long” group, and even then the short ones will still be of limited value for research. Occasionally, the letters “d.i.” appear. This stands for “données insuffisantes” and occurs if manuscript x never shares a single reading with manuscript y.

If one wishes to do other sorts of comparisons between manuscripts, one can press the button marked “Recherches” and follow the options. The number of times when x agrees with y can be determined or the number of times when x and y are in opposition to z. Not only does a percentage appear but also the list of the readings themselves with their line numbers. It will even work for second hands. I am ashamed to admit that I sometimes used the program to help me spot missing sigla although I am certain that its creator never intended it as a substitute for the ability to count!
One statement is needed before the presentation of the results. Statistics must be used with caution. Articles from the early twentieth century which claim to prove that Ovid wrote the Culex based on the use or omission of certain words are languishing in the filing cabinet unread. I was fully prepared to throw out the Adain results, even after the indescribable expenditure of time and effort, if they did not match the reliable findings of old-fashioned collation. Fortunately, the results unfolded as expected. Armed with this new tool, let us examine textual patterns in manuscripts and early printed books of the Culex.

There are two possible ways to proceed. One method is to start from atoms and void like Lucretius and pretend that we have no idea how the manuscripts fit together. The other is to assume that the reader is familiar with at least a few editions or articles on the subject and to assess the conclusions of others using the Adain program. As much as one tries to keep an open mind and start with a clean slate, one cannot help but be influenced by the OCT. Its Codices and Stemma Codicum pages are a reflection of twentieth-century efforts to sort Culex manuscripts. In the edition, one finds not only a new stemma which is a significant departure from Vollmer’s effort but also two distinct groups, Vollmer’s Iyuena Ludi Libellus and Ullman’s Florilegium Gallicum. In an earlier time, classification would have been done according to the manuscripts used by a certain editor, such as Sillig’s list of the manuscripts used by Heyne or by owner, as in the case of Colbert’s manuscripts.\(^{62}\) While we owe much to Ribbeck for a layout which is not far removed from a modern OCT, his list of sigla is simply that, a list.

\(^{62}\) Heyne-Sillig 633-634.
The *Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus* and *Florilegium Gallicum* will provide a good test for our software. If we are fortunate, perhaps we shall have some new members to add to the groups. Sigla W, B, A and T of the *Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus* may be linked together even without recourse to computer wizardry. The running titles at the beginning and end of my apparatus confirm that they belong together. E must be added using a different method. Please consider the following examples, ignoring for the moment any additional sigla:


LIBELLVS QVI NOMINATVR CVLEX (PVBLII BBnf.) VIRGILII (VIRGL' AI)

MARONIS (omisit B) (MARON ATI) FINIT CAWBTBnf.I: CVLEX P VIRGILII

MARONIS EXPLICIT E

One now sees how the *Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus* acquired its name from the first set of titles. Moving out of a decidedly unscientific mode of reasoning, we turn to Adain which looks at the sigla in two different ways. If one refers to the chart of full-length
manuscripts, finds A, then reads from left to right until the numbers drop noticeably, it becomes clear that B, T, W and E are related to A. According to the documentation which comes with the program, Adain has arrived at these figures by assigning points in ascending amounts for “leçons divergentes; leçon du lemme majoritaire; lemme minoritaire ou variante majoritaire; variante minoritaire” and finally “variante minoritaire parmi plus de deux variantes.” The coefficient is “le total de ces points de proximité, divisé par le nombre de lieux.”63 What sort of proof besides the coefficient can Adain furnish to support our theory that E should be included? As it turns out, Adain is analyzing 490 places in the text which I have identified in my apparatus as containing a noteworthy reading from E. E appears 233 times in the lemma and 257 times in another reading. It agrees with W, B, A and T 325 times or 93% of the time. If the numbers seem meaningless by themselves, there are actual passages to back them up. There is no need to print out 325 words or phrases from the Culex but a short sample will be helpful:


Thus it is clear that W, B, E, A and T belong together.

63 Adain instructions from the section marked Explications.
Is it possible that the OCT has omitted any manuscripts which should also be part of the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*? In my view, it has. Siglum I exhibits the now familiar *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* opening title.\(^64\) d reads CVLEX PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS INCIPIT and requires additional verification. I agrees with WBEAT 97% of the time while the figure for d is 91%. Michael Reeve writes about these two manuscripts and his articles are usually a good place to test one’s theories. The title of I has not escaped his notice and he does not say how he has come to a conclusion on d. He writes that I and d are witnesses to the lost *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* (L in the OCT’s stemma) noting, “Editors might as well add these two manuscripts to the five from which they reconstruct L.”\(^65\)

In Esc., the Culex is introduced by PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS IVVENALIS LVDI LIBELLVS DE CVLICE ET PASTORE INCIPIT and ends with PVBLII VIRGILII MARONIS IVVENALIS LVDI LIBELLVS DE CVLICE ET PASTORE EXPLICIT. It agrees with WBEAT 92% of the time. Laur. shares the most common *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* title with AWBTI as do Bnf. and X while Fr.’s title contains modified wording.\(^66\) The percentages of agreement with WBEAT are Laur. (79%), Bnf. (85% but only an excerpt), X (81%) and Fr. (75%).\(^67\) Professor Clausen suggested to me in an e-mail that Vat. should be investigated as a potential candidate for the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus*. Its titles tell us nothing but with 77% agreement, it is quite likely.

---

\(^64\) I is one of the sigla which had to be changed to accommodate the Adain program. Please see the legend.

\(^65\) Reeve (1976) 242. This is not to be confused with my siglum I.

\(^66\) MARONIS VIRGILII IVVENILIS LVDI INCIPIT CVLEX Fr.

\(^67\) For additional support of the theory that Laur. belongs to the *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* group, see Lord 133.
The *Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts divide themselves into two groups according to age. The early manuscripts WBEATI range in age from saec. ix to saec. xi. The late ones Laur.dFr.Esc.XVat.Bnf. start at saec. xiv and end in saec. xv/xvi. The two groups agree seven times in the following examples which all come from the lemma:

1 lusimus

1 thalia


414 uit(a)e pro /HVCCEAWBTG$s$Esc.r+a+p-UdTr.Bnf.Laur.JKNX%I%YHa.ZFr.Pom.Cor.Amb.Vat.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb.469.471.472.47 5.517.530.534./ uiita pro /F/ pro uitae /Wu.Pie./ uitam pro /KM/ omisit /Voss./

414 reddit

---

The reader may notice occasional shorthand in the Adain file. I have left it untouched in order to show prospective users that they must not exceed 255 characters per entry. Despite that caveat, the file is an ideal place to type in thoughts during collation. The computer will not read anything except for the information inside the forward slashes. Notes may be placed underneath the entries and removed at a later date. The 255 character limit does not apply to them. For the sake of clarity, I have removed any numbers added by the program so that they will not be mistaken for line numbers.
If one omits Bnf. which is really too short to be of value, one finds that WBEATI and Laur.dFr.Esc.XVat. agree 168 times. Fr. (25%), Vat. (23%) and Laur. (20%) are the individual manuscripts most likely to disagree with WBEATI. Esc. is the least likely at just 8%. The interesting fact is that when the late Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus manuscripts disagree with their elders, they are usually wrong. Later, we shall evaluate the late manuscripts to see whether there is a general statement to be made about their quality.

Now that we have performed various tests on the Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus manuscripts, we can return to our chart of full-length manuscripts and look at the coefficients of the ones which have just been discussed in order to see where they fall. We know from previous experience that the first five or so from the left can be used to bolster an argument but that it is always preferable to have additional evidence. We appear to have chosen wisely as none of our sigla appear at the far right of the page. Thus, with the help of coefficients and percentages supplied by the Adain program as well as titles and shared readings, the Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus group has been expanded to include W, B, E, A, T, I, d, Esc., Laur., Bnf., X, Fr. and Vat.

The Florilegium Gallicum manuscripts will be easier to visualize than the Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus group because the witnesses to the Florilegium Gallicum are all short excerpts which appear on the same chart.

---

69 Bnf. is not in this chart. It belongs in the chart of short excerpts.
We began our discussion of the group in the catalogue of manuscripts at siglum e. In Vollmer's 1908 article, the group had five members e, r, p, η and one manuscript which I have not seen. Ullman added a in 1928. Before turning to Adain for help, let us examine some facts which the manuscripts reveal upon quick inspection. Running titles at the beginning and end of the Culex were the key to determining membership of the Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus group. For the Florilegium Gallicum, we have titles and also verses which have been specially selected and placed in an order which conflicts with that of other manuscripts. Here are some examples:

e covers lines 58-85, 89-100, 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294, 340, 341, 342 and 413-414. r, a and p cover the same lines in the same order: My apparatus lists the opening title as DE BEATITVDINE PAVPERIS VITE. VIRGILIVS IN CVLICE erap. The coefficients in the Adain program point to a close relationship between the four but they are not next to one another. What can we say about the other manuscripts which have taken some of the prime places in our chart?

Q has crept in to the right of e. It covers lines 79-82, 294, 342 and 414. The line numbers are a partial match but there are no titles at all. We must resort to the readings themselves. Q appears 14 times in my apparatus and it agrees with erap 13 times. In the fourteenth example, p goes its own way against the others. Here are a few examples drawn from the end of the poem to illustrate agreement and disagreement:

414 funeris

70 Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Diez. B Sant. 60 will not be discussed.
414 uid(a)e pro /HVCEAWBTG$e$Esc.r+a+-p-
5.517.530.534./ uita pro /F/ pro uitae /Wu.Pie./ uitam pro /KM/ omisit /Voss./

414 reddit
/HVCFEAWBTG$e$Esc.r+a+Ud lTr.Bnf.Laur.KNQX%I%Ha.ZFr.Cor.Amb.Vat.Pie.Ad.C
i.517.530.534./reddo/U*2!Wu.OJYPom.Vi.Onb.469.471.472.475.476.479.487.492.493.5
01.502.505.507.519.529./ deddit /-p-M/ omisit /Voss./

It is obvious that Q belongs with erap. Just to clarify matters, it should be repeated that Q2 is not the same as Q nor is it a second hand correcting Q.71 Q2 is another set of Culex readings in a different part of Reg. lat. 2120. In my research, this was the only manuscript with separate sets of Culex readings. We shall come to Q2 shortly.

Tr. has lines 79-85, 89-93, 157, 155, 156, 159, 158, 225, 226, 294 and 413-414.

The unusual line order which it shares with erap for some of the verses cannot be ignored. The opening title DE PETRONIO for the Culex is very odd indeed and does not help us. Tr. agrees with group erapQ 13 times or 100%. If played off individually against the manuscripts, it is most likely to agree with Q (100%) and most likely to disagree with r and a (10%). We must surely expand the Florilegium Gallicum to include e, r, a, p, Q and Tr. We are not finished and our task is about to become more difficult.

We must turn our attention now to the misfits Bnf., η and Q2. Bnf. has already been classified as a Iuvenalis Ludi Libellus manuscript by means of its opening title but it is back again in this section to annoy and intrigue us with one unusual reading. It covers lines 1-7 and 413-414 and occurs in 17 places in total. This manuscript shares several readings with the Florilegium Gallicum group and the reading munera in line 414 is only found in e, r, a, p, Q, Tr. and Bnf. It is possible that the scribe has read ahead and has

71 A second hand in my apparatus is marked with a superscript numeral.
munere on his mind while he is trying to write funeris or perhaps there is a connection here. With so little data from Bnf., we cannot solve the puzzle.

Vollmer will haunt us yet with his η. It covers lines 79, 80, 81 and 84 while Q2 which is soon to come covers 79-82. Line numbers in the seventies and eighties seem to be a common theme here. The coefficients do not suggest that it belongs with erapTr.Q. It is almost off the map. One is tempted to reject it from the Florilegium Gallicum using this example from Rouse. On an unrelated matter concerning Tibullus, Rouse happens to make the point that "libri manuales used in the teaching of grammar and meter" were often "added to or mixed with Tibullus excerpts taken from the Florilegium Gallicum."72 He gives London, British Library, Harley 2745 as an example of just such a manual.

Line 81 of the Culex either shows a split in the Florilegium Gallicum tradition or else it proves that η and Q2 have been added from another source:

81 agnouis
/HCEAWBTGSe$Sesc.r+a+-p-UdlTr.Laur.QX%l%Fr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci.Onb./
agnoscit /Veta.Sh$Svoss.Q2YHa.Vla./ cognoscit /P/

Q2 only appears with η in two places in the Culex and both manuscripts have less than ten readings so the coefficient for η and Q2 will be abnormally high. Works other than the Culex must be used before one can determine whether η and Q2 are false members of the group or part of a subgroup. The results of our investigation for this section reveal that e, r, a, p, Tr. and Q are undoubtedly Florilegium Gallicum manuscripts but that Bnf., η and Q2 require further study.

Now that the reader is thoroughly acquainted with Culex manuscripts of every era and length, it is nearly time to add printed books into the equation. Before we do that, let

---
72 Rouse 153-154.
us offer some miscellaneous thoughts on manuscripts which do not fall into categories like *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* or *Florilegium Gallicum* and also answer a question which we posed earlier about the quality of the late manuscripts. For me, one of the most enjoyable aspects of work with manuscripts has been the chance to use the readings as a means of finding out which manuscripts any given scholar owned or used in his edition. The connection between manuscripts and other manuscripts is interesting but the connection between manuscripts and people is fascinating!

The example of Scaliger and ψ is one illustration of this. Scaliger frequently mentions a manuscript owned by or at least used by Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] of Troyes (1539-1596). There is no evidence that Pithou owned ψ but an unusual reading in line 37 of the *Culex* “memorabitur et” is found only in this manuscript, in Harley 2534 (h in my apparatus) and in Pithou’s *Epigrammata et poematia uetera*, thus making it possible that he was familiar with lat. 8207.73 Heyne and Naeke, who seem able to deduce not only which manuscripts and books scholars owned but even those which they must have consulted, unfortunately, do not give us an inventory of Pithou’s library and borrowings. Matters are further complicated by Scaliger’s choice of words. If “membrana” and “schedae” refer to different manuscripts, then the “schedae” may be lat. 8207. If the words are synonyms used interchangeably, then either Scaliger has incorrectly remembered a few readings or else we have a manuscript which cannot be

equated with ψ. Our interest in ψ has also yielded an unexpected benefit. With the help of Adain, we have discovered a ψth group.

In the catalogue of manuscripts, the ownership history of Ha. was disputed as scholars doubted Wanley’s claim that Ha. had once belonged to Aldus Manutius (1449-1515). The printer’s death falls between the first and second Aldine editions of the Culex (1505, 1517). Wright, who traced the Harleian manuscripts back to their origins, could find no recorded owner for Harley 2701 before the seventeenth century. While a single manuscript cannot tell us everything we need to know about the resources of the Aldine Press and any dispersal of those resources after the great man’s death, a comparison between Ha. and the three Aldine editions may cast some light on the matter. First, a comparison of the three printed books is necessary. Those who are familiar with the Aldines know that there were many more changes in the text between 1505 and 1517 than there were between 1517 and 1534. In the examples which I typed into the Adain file, 1505 and 1517 disagree 94% of the time while 1517 and 1534 disagree only 4% of the time. How does Ha. fit into the mix? Once it has been compared with the printed books, some results need to be removed as they could just as easily have come from printed books. It is in cases like this that all the extra work on incunabula pays off.

Manuscript Cl., a copy of the 1530 Bembo written in the nineteenth century, must be

---

74 It is worth noting that Charles Plé sent who was much more familiar with the inner thoughts of a Na eke, a Heyme or a Scaliger than we are today was not bothered by this apparent contradiction. He insisted that this manuscript was the one mentioned in the 1573 edition. See Plé sent (1910) 11. This is not the only occasion where we feel somewhat let down by our sixteenth-century Culex scholar. Scaliger’s frequent and maddening changes of heart over readings are fully documented in the apparatus. Numerous instances of bizarre wording which he claimed to have seen, wording which is nowhere to be found in our sample of fifty manuscripts, lead one to ask how many manuscripts he actually saw in person and how much faith he put in the recollections of others.
dropped but we are not forced to throw away the entire line. The same is true of the correcting hand in Laur. Examples containing multiple late manuscripts any of which could have been in the hands of the Aldine editor must be thrown away in their entirety. This is the sort of question which we would be hard-pressed to answer without the assistance of computers. Again lightens our load by cutting down the lines which need to be checked to a somewhat bearable 237 per book. After much sifting, we are left with the following examples:

37 hoc tibi

237 tue ire /HVVoss.Ha.Ci.517.530.534./ tuas iras

284 currentis


352 ac ruere /HVVoss.Laur.*2Ha.517.534./ acuere

While we cannot say for certain that Aldus Manutius owned or used Ha., it is apparent that he knew one of VVoss.Ha. or a manuscript which was very similar to them. Not only do we have a possible owner for Ha. but also a new group.

We have assigned a large number of the manuscripts to groups and the reader now has several charts at his or her disposal to assist in determining potential relationships.
This will prove especially useful in the case of manuscripts which have been passed over because they were too short, added little to our knowledge or could not be commented upon without a substantial review of Professor Clausen’s stemma. Other groups may yet emerge among the late manuscripts when we compare them with the printed books. Before we do that, let us revisit the late manuscripts and assess their quality.

From the example in which late *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts did not fare well against their elders, it is logical to suppose that *recentiores* are *deteriores*. While it is true that they pose problems for anyone who attempts to trace their descent, their readings are often a rich source of conjectures for an editor. Let us look at how likely it is that each manuscript will present the reading of the lemma. Fortunately, Adain has separated the lemma from the other readings and we are left to do simple calculations.

Please consider the chart on the next page.

The results are surprising but can perhaps be explained by the fact that the *recentiores* have access to a wide variety of readings from other manuscripts and printed books. One can go through the various readings which Adain divided into lemma and non-lemma and use the results to discover that some readings are only found in late manuscripts. Examples of this common phenomenon include:


### Table 5: Percentage of Correct Readings in Early and Late Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Manuscripts</th>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Other Readings</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 47.5% correct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late Manuscripts</th>
<th>Lemma</th>
<th>Other Readings</th>
<th>% Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laur.</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr.</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esc.</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vat.</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γ</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voss.</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha.</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pom.</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pie.</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vi.</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vla.</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad.</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ci.</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onb.</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average: 49.6% correct
After the chart of early and late manuscripts is another chart which will help us to solve the age-old question of the purity of manuscripts. The first thing to notice is that the chart contains all full-length manuscripts, not just late ones. When I first designed it, I instinctively put in only late manuscripts and realized to my horror that by omitting early manuscripts I was implying that late manuscripts were only derived from other late manuscripts. The next item which I must draw to the reader’s attention is the fact that the chart has been truncated horizontally. While I was able to fit all rare books and manuscripts vertically, there was not enough space horizontally and the font became smaller than a culex. We still have a very large sample which will be more than adequate for our purposes. A brief explanation of the correct way to read the chart is essential. In the other charts, it did not matter much whether the manuscript at the far left was earlier or later than the first one to its right as we were trying to establish links, not separate the original from the copy. For the present chart, our rule of reading five places from the left or until the numbers drop sharply cannot always stand. One obviously must cast printed books from the rows when the books are later than the one being examined. Therefore, if we read down to the third item, everything to the right of 469. must be thrown out up to IPom.Vi. as there were no printed Virgils before 1469.

Let us begin by isolating the full-length manuscripts which were copied in the fifteenth century or later. They are as follows:

**Ad.**, Ci., Esc., Fr., Γ, Ha., I, Onb., Pie., Pom., U, Vat., Vi., Vla., Voss., X and Y.

Next, we should find some uncomplicated examples which best illustrate how the program works. Manuscripts Esc., Ha. and Pie. have dates which fall before the first printed Virgil and ought to proclaim that fact in their results. When we read from left to
right, we notice that the first few slots are occupied by manuscripts. This is a good sign
and means that it is likely that these manuscripts were not copied from printed books. We
have little to worry about except for errors in dates. Early manuscripts A and T illustrate
the type of error which I find myself falling into occasionally. The Adain results could
lead someone to state that A was copied from T when, in fact, our manuscript catalogue
tells us that A is saec. x and T is saec. xi. This proves that the results must always be
used in conjunction with a reliable catalogue or scholarly article. It is enough here in this
prolegomenon to determine which manuscripts were copied from books. The task of
deciding which manuscripts are copies of other manuscripts is better saved for an edition.

Γ bears no resemblance to printed books and the chart demonstrates that a date
before the first printed Virgil is warranted. Cl. is known to be a copy of Bembo’s work of
1530 yet it has been corrected with the help of another printed book. Adain shows us that
the copyist of Cl. used Scaliger’s 1573 Culex. Ad.’s date of 1460 has been called an
approximation but it cannot be far from the mark as there are no printed books in the
vicinity of the manuscript. This marks the end of the clear-cut cases and now the brain-
teasers begin!

The scribe of Vi. shows an unnatural fondness for Ascensius Virgils. His work
agrees 90% of the time with both 1501 and 1507. 1507 has a higher coefficient than 1501
due to the placement of the readings but at 94% agreement, they are really the same book.
Vi. must be at least from 1501 and this is confirmed by the manuscript catalogue.
Galletier claims in his Epigrammata et Priapea that our I has the same text as “l’édition
Vicentina de l’Appendix (1479)” and also that for manuscripts such as I “la critique n’a
pas encore, semble-t-il, réussi à déterminer s’ils ont servi de base aux éditions
contemporaines ou s’ils ont été copiés sur elles.\(^75\) The 479. in my chart is from Parma. I have not seen the edition listed in Galletier’s book but I have perused a 1476 edition from Venice which exhibits a suspiciously high (96%) rate of agreement with I. Plessent believes that I was the model for the edition of 1479 while Naeke takes the opposite view.\(^76\) As there are almost no manuscripts in I’s row and only late ones at that, one must give the nod to Naeke. If the reader inspects the chart of full-length manuscripts, it will become obvious that Pom. is related to I and VI. They share a high degree of agreement (86%). The first rare book to the right of Pom. must be crossed out as it is later than saec. xv. We are looking for an edition something like 1476 as a source for Pom. although we would have preferred a higher percentage of agreement (75%). There are always more incunabula to see and perhaps one will yet be found which is a closer fit. Michael Reeve suggests that our Pom. is “not earlier than 1473” because of Leto’s journey to Moscow.\(^77\) This is the sort of extra work which must be done when computers and even incunabula fail to answer the question. It is, I am sure, a highly rewarding process which I hope to attempt in the future when the group of manuscripts involved is not so unwieldy.

Ci., I, VI. and Pom. have already been unmasked as frauds. Professor Reeve wishes to add U to the list of shame. He is suspicious of lines 22-23 aerios nemorum saltus because that reading is found in printed books; however, our collation of the fifty manuscripts tells us that U shares this reading with manuscripts of a respectable age such

\(^{75}\) Galletier 75.

\(^{76}\) Plessent (1910) 22; Naeke 369.

\(^{77}\) Reeve (1975) 234-235.
as *Laur.* and *Pie.* Nothing in the Adain results suggests that *U* deserves such harsh treatment. *U*², of course, dabbles very freely in printed books. *Fr., Vat.* and *X* are on solid ground because of their status as *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts. *Onb.* is a problem. It mostly stays with *Iuuenalis Ludi Libellus* manuscripts but occasionally strays from the path and seems to choose unreliable friends such as 1469 and *I Pompei. Voss.* is firmly established along with *Ha.* as a descendant of *V.* Finally, *Vla.* and *Y* are related to *Pie. UAd.* and were not copied from printed books.

It is my hope that this section has answered some questions and raised even more. Historical evidence, line counts per page and personal visits to libraries with incunabula may be more trustworthy than a computer program but when one cannot cover all facets of manuscript research to one’s own satisfaction, Adain may prove to be a useful tool.

---

⁷⁸ Reeve (1975) 237 n. 29.
Chapter Three: The Apparatus Criticus of the Culex

The task of condensing a catalogue of manuscripts in the style of Munk Olsen and a list of printed books along the lines of Mambelli into a legend of several pages before the start of the apparatus criticus is, to say the least, a daunting prospect.\textsuperscript{79} It has not escaped my notice that the reader cannot be expected to refer back to the manuscript descriptions; nevertheless, one does not want to repeat all the information. As for the printed books, after comparing the styles of various editions, it seemed best to follow R. P. H. Green's Oxford Classical Text of Ausonius. It was interesting and helpful to discover how another scholar dealt with the problem of giving sigla to many books without turning the "Editions Cited" page into a mini-bibliography.

Unlike the bibliography at the end of the thesis which follows M.L.A. guidelines, the present section lists editions, articles from scholarly journals and all other works relevant to the apparatus criticus according to date.\textsuperscript{80} Many recent editions had little to add to the text but this is hardly surprising given the difficulty of finding previously unseen manuscripts and the slim chance of inventing a conjecture which can be proven to be original. It seemed unjust to exclude them for simply being "born too late" and unwise to portray the number of editions as being considerably smaller than it was. Therefore, the decision was made to list all editions consulted, but only those with something new to offer were assigned a siglum.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{79} Giuliano Mambelli, Gli annali delle edizione Virgiliane (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1954).

\textsuperscript{80} Occasionally, it was necessary to refer to specific page numbers if the work was not an edition of the Culex or in the case of periodicals. The reader will find page numbers with the sigla rather than in the apparatus criticus.

\textsuperscript{81} The format for editions with new readings is siglum = rest of entry.
It is my hope that the inclusion of so many pre-1500 editions will pleasantly
surprise those who doubt that these works have anything of value to offer. We are doing a
great disservice to scholarship by scoffing at material which can assist us not only in
determining the earliest date of a certain reading but also whether manuscripts are being
copied wholly or in part from printed books. I do not claim to have seen all extant printed
Virgils but I have studied a more-than-representative sample of the earliest offerings and
feel qualified to pronounce on trends in the development of the text. Every attempt has
been made to include significant advances in Virgilian textual criticism from all eras up
to the modern day. Many post-Renaissance editions have not been studied with the care
that they deserve as copies are scarce and often inaccessible to non-Europeans. We must
continuously search for new evidence, refuse to simply recopy the mistakes of others and
work in a collaborative rather than competitive fashion if we are to have any chance of
improving corrupt texts.

As for the layout of the apparatus criticus, I have modelled it on an Oxford
Classical Text. At the top of each page, a revised version of Professor Clausen’s text of
the Culex appears. Below the text, the variant readings of all the manuscripts, early-
printed books and modern editions are presented in the approved format with Latin notes.
I took into account a complaint expressed in Professor Mary Louise Lord’s article that
“despite their valiant efforts . . . editors do not give complete readings of every
manuscript in their list of sigla.” In this prolegomenon, each manuscript was collated
letter by letter. I did not select passages at random or from the two ends of the poem.
Professor John Grant wishes that editors would be more clear about the date when a
certain reading was first printed. He gives an example of a reading dated 1475 by
Professor Clausen which actually occurs in many editions before that date. I have tried to be as careful as possible with dates but the reader is always encouraged to examine incunabula which are absent from the bibliography. If a reading is very rare and only occurs in a few editions, I give two examples. If there is a close relationship such as the one which Professor Grant has discovered between Pietro Bembo and the Aldine Press, I list both Bembo and the Aldine edition as possible sources of the conjecture. In cases where there are many variant readings for a given entry, I note the first appearance in print of each one whenever possible. If I refer to one author as being in the edition of another, I mean that author x is reported in author y as being the inventor of a particular conjecture. This statement cannot be confirmed either because there is no sign of the conjecture in x’s edition or because the edition is not available.

Unlike some Renaissance editors who printed the vulgate version of a text without corrections and then presented their changes in a commentary, my changes will be brought to the reader’s attention in three ways. They will first appear in italics in the text. Next, there will be a note below indicating that Professor Clausen opted for a different solution to the problem. Finally, my choice of reading will be justified in the commentary. Although the software would have allowed me to insert the commentary on the same page underneath the text and notes, it seemed that a clear and simple layout with commentary at the end was best. Alas, few programmers have invented software to help those who strive to imitate the OCT’s polished appearance. I prepared my pseudo-OCT

---
of pseudo-Virgil using Dr. Stefan Hagel’s Classical Text Editor software which can be downloaded from the Internet and purchased from its creator.

The current practice in the Oxford Classical Text series is to give the English name of the place that holds the manuscript. I have followed recent editors in this decision. The order of the sigla in the manuscript entries is continued in the apparatus. The order has no special significance. It is simply the order in which the manuscripts were collated starting with those used by Professor Clausen in his edition. Any individual missing lines are noted in the apparatus. Running titles such as variations of the words *incipit/explicit Culex* can be found at the beginning and end of the apparatus.

Despite the large number of sigla, no symbols were used to signify a group of manuscripts. Some will argue that this notation would have simplified the apparatus. I beg to differ, citing Willis who warns that it must be made clear whether siglum β represents “the agreement of BVZ . . . the reading of the manuscript from which BVZ were derived” or “the agreement of the uncorrected reading in any two of them.” Willis then switches to a different group of manuscripts and accuses L. D. Reynolds of indiscriminate sigla-swapping. In the introduction, a is said to be the *fons codicum* LQg but in 12 places a = LQg and in 52 places a = LQ. Willis sees “no disadvantage in indicating the agreement of LQg by LQg” and that desire for clarity is a guiding principle in this thesis.

---


84 Willis 40.
Sigla

- **V = VATICAN CITY, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 2759, saec. xii-xiii.** (pp. 18-19)\(^{85}\)
- **C = CAMBRIDGE, University Library, Kk.5.34, saec. x.** (pp. 19-20)
- **F = MELK, Stiftsbibliothek 717, saec. x.** (pp. 21-22)
- **E = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8093, saec. x.** (pp. 22-24)
- **A = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 7927, saec. x.** (pp. 24-25)
- **W = TRIER, Stadtbibliothek 1086, saec. ix.** (pp. 25-26)
- **S = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 17177, saec. xi.** (pp. 26-27)
- **B = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3252, saec. ix-x.** (pp. 27-29)
- **T = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8069, saec. xi.** (pp. 29-30)
- **Γ = ROME, Biblioteca dell’Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei e Corsiniana 43 F 5, saec. xv.** (pp. 30-31)
- **ψ = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8207, saec. xiii-xiv.** (pp. 31-32)
- **e = EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo del Escorial Q.I.14, saec. xiv.** (pp. 32-35)
- **Esc. = EL ESCORIAL, Real Biblioteca de San Lorenzo del Escorial f.I.19, anno 1407.** (p. 36)
- **r = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 17903, saec. xiii.** (pp. 36-38)
- **a = ARRAS, Bibliothèque Municipale 64, saec. xiii.** (pp. 38-39)
- **p = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 7647, saec. xii-xiii.** (pp. 39-40)

\(^{85}\) Page numbers refer to catalogue entries in Chapter One.
• **U = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Urb. lat. 350, saec. xv.** (pp. 40-41)

• **d = OXFORD, Bodleian Library, Auct. F.1.17, saec. xiv.** (pp. 41-42)

• **η = LONDON, British Library, Harley 2745, saec. xiii-xiv.** (pp. 42-44)

• **h = LONDON, British Library, Harley 2534, saec. xiii.** (pp. 44-45)

• **Voss. = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. O. 81, saec. xv.** (pp. 45-46)

• **l = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. F. 78, saec. xv.** (p. 46)

• **Tr. = Troyes, Bibliothèque Municipale, 2013, saec. xv.** (pp. 46-48)

• **Wu. = Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek, M.ch.f. 60, saec. xiv-xv.** (pp. 48-49)

• **Bnf. = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 3343, saec. xv.** (pp. 49-50)

• **Laur. = FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana, Plut. 33.31, saec. xiv.** (pp. 50-51)

• **O = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1374, saec. xvi.** (pp. 51-52)

• **J = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1576, saec. xiv.** (p. 52)

• **K = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1671, saec. x.** (p. 53)

• **M = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. lat. 1412, saec. xii.** (pp. 53-54)

• **N = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ross. 503, saec. xiii fol. 1-88, saec. xv reliqua.** (pp. 54-55)
- Q = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 2120, saec. xii-xiii. (pp. 55-57)
- X = LONDON, British Library, Harley 3963, saec. xv. (pp. 57-58)
- I = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. lat. 1719, saec. x-xi. (pp. 58-59)
- Y = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, Voss. lat. O. 96, saec. xv. (p. 59)
- Bpl. = LEIDEN, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit B.P.L. 35, saec. xi-xii. (pp. 59-60)
- Ha. = LONDON, British Library, Harley 2701, anno 1447. (pp. 60-61)
- Z = LONDON, British Library, Burney 273, saec. xii-xiii. (pp. 61-62)
- Fr. = PARIS, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 8205, saec. xv. (pp. 62-63)
- Pom. = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 3255, saec. xv. (pp. 63-64)
- Cor. = VENICE, Museo Correr, Cicogna 886, saec. xv-xvi. (pp. 64-66)
- Amb. = MILAN, Biblioteca Ambrosiana H 178 inf., saec. xii-xiii. (p. 66)
- Vat. = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 1586, saec. xv. (pp. 66-67)
- Pie. = NEW YORK, Pierpont Morgan Library M. 223, anno 1455. (pp. 67-68)
- Vi. = VIENNA, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3230, saec. xvi. (p. 68)
- Vla. = VATICAN CITY, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 7192, saec. xv-xvi. (pp. 68-69)
- Ad. = LONDON, British Library, Add. 16562, saec. xv. (pp. 69-70)
- Ci. = VENICE, Museo Correr, Cicogna 1775, saec. xix. (pp. 70-71)
- Onb. = VIENNA, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek 3108, saec. xv. (pp. 71-72)
- OXFORD, Bodleian Library, Canon. Class. Lat. 54, saec. xv, appears only in the commentary. (pp. 72-74)

- *ed. Rom. 1471* = Conradus Sweynheym and Arnoldus Pannartz, Rome.\(^{86}\)

- *ed. Venet. 1472* = B. H. perhaps the initials of the printer, probably Venice.


- *ed. Venet. 1476* = Antonio di Bartolommeo Miscomini, Venice.\(^{87}\)

- *ed. Parm. 1479* = Andreas Portilia, Parma.

- *ed. Flor. 1487* = perhaps Bernardus Nerlius, Florence.\(^{88}\)


- *ed. Venet. 1493* = Bartholomaeus de Zanis de Portesio, Venice.


---

\(^{86}\) Rare Virgils are notoriously hard to search for in online databases as often the table of contents must serve as a title. It is not advisable to input the words “Virgil(ii)” or “Opera” as they will either produce a system overload error or worse, a mountain of useless information. If the database will allow a search by date, then the chances of finding an exact match improve considerably. As time goes on, thankfully, the titles become more complete. For examples of titles, see Mambelli’s work and also Martin Davies and John Goldfinch, *Virgil: A Census of Printed Editions* (London: The Bibliographical Society, 1992). Mr. Goldfinch kindly endured endless cross-examination concerning the presence of the *Culex* in some editions and its exclusion from others. Subsequent verification proved that he was, indeed, correct in all cases.

\(^{87}\) The date on the edition itself was erroneously given as 1486.

\(^{88}\) He may not have been a printer. For more details, see Davies and Goldfinch 64.
• *ed. Grüninger. 1502* = Johannes Grüninger, Strasbourg.

• *ed. Ald. 1505* = Aldus Manutius Romanus, Venice.


• *ed. Ald. 1517* = Aldus Manutius Romanus and Andreas de Torresanis de Asula, Venice.  

• *ed. Ascens. 1519* = commentary of Ascensius but printed by Aug. de Zanis de Portesio, Venice.  

• *ed. Ascens. 1529* = commentary of Ascensius but printed by Jean Crespin, Lyon.

• *Bembus* = Pietro Bembo, Venice, 1530.

---

89 While I was researching later Ascensius editions with the help of Renouard's book, I came upon some interesting information concerning the first printing of the *Opuscula*. In the Oxford Classical Text, Professor Clausen refers to an *ed. Ascens.* of the *Opuscula* in the year 1500 which I have never been able to find. Perhaps he is thinking of the section on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* which was printed "8 des calendes de mai 1500." The earliest edition of the *Opuscula* is "15 mars 1501." See Ph. Renouard, *Bibliographie des impressions et des oeuvres de Josse Badius Ascensius imprimeur et humaniste*, Vol. III (New York: Burt Franklin, 1967) 357-358. Mambelli also does not distinguish between the different volumes and settles on a date of 1500. Fortunately for scholars, the *French books before 1601* microfilm series contains two different copies of the first *Opuscula*.

90 There is no need to include the 1512 Ascensius in the Adain program as the Ascensius is well-represented by the editions of 1501, 1507, 1519 and 1529.

91 Aldus is credited with this edition but it appears after his death. The Aldine editions are less fruitful for *Culex* scholars than the Ascensius Virgils. One can usually pick up an Ascensius and expect to find the *Culex* but only the 1505, 1517 and 1534 Aldines contain the work. In order to avoid unnecessary searches, see Craig Kallendorf, *A Bibliography of Venetian Editions of Virgil*, 1470-1599 (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1991).

92 The editions which bear the commentary of Ascensius on the *Culex* all have similar text and form a group. For that reason I have chosen to use the designation *ed. Ascens.* even for editions printed outside of France. Renouard does not explain what constitutes a "real" Ascensius and simply lists all works with some connection to the man, even those which appeared after his death.
• *ed. Ald. 1534* = heirs of Aldus Manutius Romanus and Andreas de Torresanis de Asula, Venice.


• *Melanchthon* = Philip Melanchthon, Zurich, 1570.


• Christopher Plantin (Antwerp, 1575) reprints the 1573 Scaliger with no changes.

• *Fabricius* = Georgius Fabricius, Basel, 1575.

• *Petrus Pithoeus* = Pierre Pithou, Lyon, 1596.

• *Taubmannus, in commentario Taubmanni* = Friedrich Taubmann, Wittemberg, 1618.

• *Barthius* = Kaspar von Barth, Frankfurt, 1624.

• The editions of Daniel Heinsius (Leiden, 1636) and Nicolaas Heinsius (Amsterdam, 1676; reprinted Utrecht, 1704; Amsterdam, 1725 etc.) reproduce Pietro Bembo’s text except for a few readings which follow the *editio princeps* instead.\(^93\)

• *Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717, Lindenbrogius in editione Masuicii 1717* = Pancratius Masuicius [Maaswyck], Leeuwarden.\(^94\)

• *Nicolaas Heinsius in libro Adversariorum* = Nicolaas Heinsius, Harlingen, 1742, 50-51 and 617.\(^95\)

---

\(^93\) A quick glance at the edition of 1469 reveals that the Heinsius family has borrowed readings as follows: 151 hanc, 203 aurato and 282 amara. All line numbers are those of the OCT.

\(^94\) Some notes by Scaliger and Lindenbruch from 1595 exist, probably unchanged, in the Masuicius in my personal collection.

\(^95\) Apart from a few conjectures in his *Adversariorum, Culex* notes by Nicolaas Heinsius were not accessible to me. I suspect that they may be preserved in
• Pieter Burman the Younger’s edition (Amsterdam, 1746) reprints a Nicolaas Heinsius text identical or very similar to the one from 1676.

• *Heyne in editione sua* = the main text of Christian Gottlob Heyne, Leipzig, 1775. My copy is from 1793. When I refer to the notes under the text, I write *Heyne in commentario editionis* or *in commentario editionis Heynii*.

• *Heyne “probabiliter restitutus”* = Christian Gottlob Heyne, Leipzig. My copy is from 1793 but I assume that it was first printed in 1775 and included with the edition.

• *Schrader* = Johannes Schrader, Leeuwarden, 1776.

• *Friesemannus, in editione Friesemannii* = Hendrik Frieseman, Amsterdam, 1786.

• *Nodell* = Jan Nodell, Amsterdam, 1787.

• *Wakefield* = Gilbert Wakefield, London, 1796.

• Lucius Sargent (Boston, 1807) translates the text of Masuicius and adds some notes.

• Henri de Valori, Paris, 1817.

• Christian Gottlob Heyne’s edition (London, 1818) reprints the “Culex probabiliter restitutus” without changes.

• A. J. Valpy’s edition (London, 1819) reprints Heyne’s text, notes and “Culex probabiliter restitutus” without changes.

• *Bothe* = Friedrich Bothe, Heidelberg, 1821.

• J. Krag, Odense, 1825.

• The Virgil from the Tauchnitz series (Leipzig, 1829) does not mention the editor’s name. It has a combination of readings from Bembo and Scaliger.

---
correspondence. The editions which I purchased (1676, 1704, 1725) did not yield any new information. In cases where many scholars have attributed conjectures to Heinsius, I write *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*. 
• *Sillig* = Sillig's revision of Heyne's edition, Leipzig, 1832.


• *Amar* = J. A. Amar, Paris, 1838.

• Albert Forbiger, Leipzig, 1846.

• August Naeke, Bonn, 1847.

• *Jahn* = Johannes Jahn, Leipzig, 1850.

• *Hertzberg/Osiander* = Wilhelm Hertzberg and Christian Osiander, Stuttgart, 1853.

• *Paldamus* = Hermann Paldamus, Leipzig, 1854.

• *Haupt in opusculis* = *Opuscula* of Moritz Haupt written in 1858 but reprinted at Hildesheim in 1967.

• Friedrich Dubner, Paris, 1858.

• *Schenkl* = Karl Schenkl, *Zeitschrift für die Österreichischen Gymnasien* 18 (1867): 771-800.

• *Ribbeck* = Otto Ribbeck, Leipzig, 1868.

• *Maehly* = J. Maehly, *Heidelberger Jahrbücher der Literatur* 49 (1870) 830.

• *Haupt in editione* = Moritz Haupt, Leipzig, 1873.

• *Baehrens* = Emil Baehrens, Leipzig, 1880.

• William Sidney Walker's *Corpus poetarum latinorum* (London, 1881) reprints Heyne's "*Culex probabiliter restitutus*" without changes.

• E. Benoist, Paris, 1882.

• Georg Thilo, Leipzig, 1886.

• *Leo* = Friedrich Leo, Berlin, 1891.


• *Ellis* = Robinson Ellis, Oxford, 1907. It was reprinted in 1927 without changes.

• *Vollmer* = Friedrich Vollmer, Leipzig, 1910.

• Charles Plésent, Paris, 1910.

• *Alton* = E. H. Alton, *Hermathena* 42 (1920) 68.

• H. Rushton Fairclough, London, 1925.

• Gaetano Curcio, Turin, 1928.

• Willy Morel, Leipzig, 1930.

• Maurice Rat, Paris, 1935.

• *Herrmann* = Léon Herrmann, Leiden, 1950.


• Caterina Vassalini’s edition (Florence, 1951) follows Plésent for the most part but introduces a few readings from other sources.


• *Salvatore* (1957) = Armando Salvatore, Turin, 1957.

• Tarcisio Poma (Lugano, 1957) reprints Heyne’s text and offers an Italian translation.


• Remo Giomini, Florence, 1962.

• Armando Salvatore, Naples, 1964.

• *Housman ad Manil.* = A. E. Housman, Hildesheim, 1972, 33.


• *Salvatore et al. (1997)* = Armando Salvatore et al., Rome, 1997.
CVLEX

LVSIMVS, Octaui, gracili modulate Thalia
atque ut araneoli tenuem formauimus orsum;

Titulum omiserunt VvηhWu.KQK2bpl.ZCor.Amb.: titulus haec operi olim erat sed hodie non superest in S: CVLEX


CFETTEsc.dlVat.: legi non potuit A
lusimus: haec propter culicis sint carmina docta,
omnis et historiae per ludum consonet ordo
notitiaeque ducum *uoces.* licet inuidus adsit.
quisquis erit culpare iocos musamque paratus,
pondere uel culcis leuior famaque feratur.
posterius grauiore sono tibi musa loquetur
nostra, dabunt cum securos mihi tempora fructus,
ut tibi digna tuo poliantur carmina sensu.

Laetonae magnique Iouis decus, aurea proles,
Phoebus erit nostri princeps et carminis auctor
et recinent e lyra fautor, siue educat illum
Arna Chimaerae Xanthi perfusa liquore

---

seu decus Asteriae seu qua Parnasia rupes
hinc atque hinc patula praepandit cornua fronte
Castaliaeque sonans liquido pede labitur unda.
quare, Pierii laticis decus, ite, sorores
Naides, et celebrate deum ludente chorea.
et tu, sancta Palea, ad quam uentura recurrunt
agrestum bona fetura – sit cura tenentis
aerios nemorum cultus siluasque uirentes:
te cultrice uagus saltus feror inter et antra.

at tu, cui meritis oritur fiducia chartis,

Octavi uenerande, meis adlabere coeptis,
sancte puer, tibi namque canit non pagina bellum
triste Iouis ponique [canit non pagina bellum]
Phlegra, Giganteo sparsa est quae sanguine tellus,
nec Centaureos Lapithas compellit in enes;
urit Ericthonias Oriens non ignibus arcus,
non perfossus Athos nec magno uincula ponto
iacta meo quacrent iam sera uolumine famam,
non Hellepontus pedibus pulsatus equorum,
Graecia cum timuit uenientis undique Persas –

mollia sed tenui *decurrent carmina uersu.*

uiribus apta suis Phoebo duce ludere gaudet.

hoc tibi, sancte puer; memorabilis et tibi *constet*

gloria perpetuum lucens mansura per aequum,

et tibi sede pia maneat locus, et tibi sospes

---

35 ollia d *decurrent carmina* St. Louis sequens Calpurnium Siculum. uide commentarium. decurrers

carmina Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: pede carmina currere VV\*\*\*\*\*Voss.Ha.: pede currere


1573 *in uers.*: percurrere carmina Scaliger *ed.* 1573 *in comm.*: decurrere carmina Ribbeck: currentia

carmina Schmidt lectionem Heinsii probavit Clausen. *uersu*


1544, Scaliger *ed.* 1573 *in comm.* legens schedas Pithoeei

puer


\( \Gamma \): memorabilitur et \( \psi \) Scaliger *ed.* 1573 *in comm.*,, Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou] Epigrammata:

Scaliger *ed.* 1573 *in uers.*: mortalibus ut *ed. Ald.* 1534: memorabere sic Heyne "probabiliter restitutas"
tibi constet *Wagenvoort:*

certet

cernet C: sibi perstet Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: tibi certa est Bothe: tibi crescet Sillig:
certest Bauhrens: tibi restet Ellis: tibi certe Herrmann: tibi certet cum codicibus scripsit Clausen. 38


\( \tilde{\text{m}} \)sura \( \psi \): uictura Heyne "probabiliter restitutas" 39 *te ed.* Ald. 1534
debita felices memoretur uita per annos,
grata bonis lucens. sed nos ad coepta feramur.

igneus aetherias iam sol penetrabat in arces
candidaque aurato quatiebat lumina curru,
crinibus et roseis tenebras Aurora fugabat:
propulit e stabulis ad pabula laeta capellas
pastor et excelsi montis iuga summa petuit,

uuidea qua patulos uelabant gramina colles.

---

Parm. 1479: liceat IPom.Vi. ed. Rom. 1469: uerbum omisit W uel ferantur scriptis \( T^2 \) post feramur. in T eadem manus nonnumquam duas lectiones in eodem uersu scribebat. secunda lectio fortasse coniectura erat. in his locis secundam lectionem numero 2 notaui. 42 igneus
iam siluis dumisque uagae, iam uallibus abdunt corpora, iamque omni celebres e parte uagantes
tondebant tenero uiridantia gramina morsu.
scruplea desertas haerebant ad caua rupes,
pendula proiectis carpuntur et arbuta ramis,
densaque uirgultis auide labrusca petuntur.
haec suspensa rapit carpente cacumina morsu

Taubmannus in commentario suo scrisit, "puto colorem hic non attendi: sed potius humorem." lurida

tondebant C: tundebant h2: tondentur Ci. Bembus tenera F 51 uersus 55 scriptus est post 50 in U.
post 49 posuerunt Ci. et Bembus. haerebant (he- EWBTTEsc.UldLaur.XVat.Pie.Vi.Vla.Onb., ae- l)
herebat Fr.: perreputi Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: repebant Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: omisit
Bembus: ripis (-pp- ψ2) ψ2h: omisit Ad. 52 raris Γ 53 uel brusca ed. Rom. 1473 54 nec Melanchthon
rodente Schraderus in scriptis multorum eruditorum morsu
Nic. Erythraeus in commentario Taubmanni: dente Heyne "probabiliter restitutas"
nr. xalicis lentae uel quae noua nascitur alnus,

haec ist. ras fruticum sentes rimatur, at illa

imminet intuítu prostantis imaginis umbrae.

o bona pastoris (si quis non pauperis usum
mente prius docta fastidiat et probet illis

somnia luxuriae spretis) incognita curis
quae lacerant auidas inimico pectore mentes.
si non Assyrio fuerint bis lota colore
Attalicis opibus data uellera, si nitor auri
sub laqueare domus animum non angit auarum
picturaeque decus, lapidum nec fulgor in ulla
cognitus utilitate manet, nec pocula gratum
Alconis referunt Boethique toreuma, nec Indi
conchea baca maris pretio est, at pectore puro

60 somnia Haupt in opusculis et in editione: omnia

65
saepe super tenero prostermit gramine corpus,

florida cum tellus, gemmantis picta per herbas,

uere notat dulci distincta coloribus arua;
atque illum calamo laetum recinentem palustri
otiaque inuidia degentem et fraude remota
pollentemque sibi uiridi cum palmine lucens

Tmolia pampineo subter coma uelat amictu.

illi sunt gratae rorantes lacte capellae

et nemus et secunda Pales et uallibus intus

Rom. 1469: nunc Voss.Ha.: nouat Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum dulci
CFEAWBTT\dlIPom.Onb. ed. Rom. 1469: duriss \w:\ pulchris Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501. in margine Pithoet
[Pierre Pithou] Epigrammata coloribus

ligonibus \w:\ 72 recanente Scaliger in editione Musucii 1717 legens membranam Antonii Contii

degente FAd.: degendo \w:\ et \vreap Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": ac U\dlIPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469:

Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 75 (uel Pie.2) tmolia (thm- VT\vreaph.Ha.2Pie.2)


orante \w:\: grata rorantes l: uaccae et rorantes Wakefield: grauidae rorant Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"
1469: palus V: palles C ualle Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": intus

semper opaca nouis manantia fontibus antra.

quis magis optato queat esse beatior aeuo

quam qui mente procul pura sensuque probando non auidas agnuiit opes nec tristia bella

nec funesta timet ualidae certamina classis nce, spoliis dum sancta deum fulgentibus ornent templa uel euctus finem transcendent habendi,

___
ed. Rom. 1469: yacu (iac-h) ψh: sub ima Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"

aduersum saeuis ulтро caput hostibus offert?

delay falso deus coliturn non arte politus,

ille colit lucos, illi Panchaia turâ

floribus agrestes herbae uariantibus adsunt,

illi dulcis adest requies et pura uoluptas.

liber a supplicibus curis, huic imminet, omnis

derigit huc sensus, haec cura est subdita cordi,

quolibet ut requie uictu contentus abundet
iucundoque *leuet* languentia corpora somno.

o pecudes, o Panes et o gratissima tempe

*frondis* Hamadryadum, quarum non diuuit cultu

aemulus Ascræo pastor sibi quisque poetae

securam placido traducit pectore uitam.

talibus in studiis baculo dum nixus apicas


γh. ψ 95 non est uersus Culicis. laetissima Wakefield 95 frondis hamadryadum *Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum*: fontis hamadryadum


pastor agit curas et dum non arte canora
compacta solitum modulatur harundine carmen,
tendit ineuctus radios Hyperonis ardom
lucidaque aetherio ponit discrimina mundo,
qua iacit Oceanum flammis in utrumque rapaces.
et iam compellente uagae pastore capellae
ima susurrantis repetebant ad uada lymphae
quae subter uridem residebant caerula muscum.
iam medias operum partes euectus erat sol,

Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"

Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: letus erap Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. fortasse in animo habuit unus ex erap?

Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"

CVsEAWBTTesc.rapU2dVoss.llaur.XIYHaf.pom.vat.piеВи.Vla.ad.onb.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469:
compacto C solitum codex ex collectione "GiannalisFaltrinelli Collection S. N." olim in bibliotheca
Morgan. dedit solidum, tum uerbum rescriptum est solidum. ed. Ald. 1505: solidum
VCsEAWBTTesc.rapU2dVoss.llaur.XIYHaf.pom.vat.piеВи.Vla.ad.onb.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469:
solium
UAd. post hunc uersum Scaliger versus 154, 148, 149, 146, 147, 150, 151, 152, 153, 157, 155, 156,
159, 158 posuit. hunc ordinem in codices erap inueniet lector. post uersum 158 Scaliger 101, 102 etc.
dedit. in euentus Fr.: in eubois Ad.: in euectus Ci.: ut euectus Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: iam
euectus Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": legi non potuit Onb. qua
VCsEAWBTTesc.dVoss.laur.XIHa.Fr.vat.piеВи.ad.Ci. ed. Parm. 1479, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: cum
ed. Parm. 1479: cete anus Onb. uix legi potuit Onb. rapaces] coruscas Heyne "probabiliter restitutus"

ima] lene Schraderus in scriptis multorum eruditorum repetebant
1573 in uers.: uel repedebant V2: repedabant C: repedant Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 106 residebant]
resonabat Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" caerula] garrula Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum
cum densas pastor pecudes cogebat in *umbras*

*et* procul aspexit luco residere uirenti,

Delia diua, tuo, quo quondam uicta furore

uenit Nyctelium fugiens Cadmeis Agae,

infandas scelerata manus et caede cruenta,

quae gelidis bacchata iugis requieuit in antro

posterius poenam nati de morte datura –

hic etiam uiridi ludentes Panes in herba

et Satyri Dryadesque chorus egere puellae

---


Naiadum in coetu. non tantum Oeagrius Hebrum restantem tenuit ripis siluasque canendo quantum te, pernix, remorantem, diua, chorea multa tuo laetae fundentes gaudia uultu, ipsa loci natura domum resonante susurro

quis dabet et dulci fessas refouebat in umbra.
nam primum prona surgebant ualle patentes
aeriae platanus, inter quas impia lotos,
impia, quae socios Ithaci maerentis abegit,
hospita dum nimia tenuit dulcedine captos.
at, quibus ignipedum curru proiectus equorum
ambustus Phaethon luctu mutauerat artus,
Heliades, teneris implexae bracchia truncis,
candida fundebant tentis uelamina ramis.
posterius cui Demophoon aeterna reliquit
 perfidiam lamentandi mala – perfide multis,

perfide Demophoon et nunc deflende puellis.

quam comitabantur, fatalia carmina, quercus,
quercus ante datae Cereris quam semina uitaef

(illas Triptolemi mutuit sulcus arisit).}

hic magnum Argoac naui decus addita pinus

proceros decorat siluas hirsuta per artus
ac petit aeris contingere motibus astra.

*ilicis et species nigrae et lethaeae: cypressus*

umbrosaeque manent fagus hederaeque ligantes
brachchia, fraternos plangat ne populus ictus,
ipsaeque ascendunt ad summa cacumina lentae
pingunque aureolos uiridi pallore corymbos.
quis aderat ueteris myrtus non nescia fati.

at uolucre patulis residentes dulcia ramis
carmina per uarios edunt resonantia cantus.

his suberat gelidis manans e fontibus unda,

quae leuibus placidum riuis sonat orta liquorem;

et quaqua geminas auium uox obstrepit aures,

hac querulae referunt uoces quis nantia lino

145 Scaliger versus 157 iterum sed aliter usus est. uide notas ad uersum 100 et ad uersum 157. post uersum 157 Scaliger versus 160, 161, 162, 163 etc. posuit. in libro suo Scaliger versus transposuit sed commentarium non transposuit. magna est perturbatio lectoris! 146 ac Fabricius 148 suberat

corpora lympha fouet; sonitus alit aeris echo,
argutis et cuncta fremunt ardores cicadis.

at circa passim fessae cubuere capellae
excelsis subter dumis, quos leniter adflans

aura susurrantis poscit confundere uenti.
pastor, ut ad fontem densa requieuit in umbra,
mitem concepit proiectus membra soporem,
anxius insidiis nullis, sed lentus in herbis
securo pressos somno mandauerat artus.
stratus humi dulcem capiebat corde quietem,
ni Fors incertos iussisset ducere casus.
nam solitum uoluens ad tempus tractibus isdem
immanis uario maculatus corpore serpens,
mersus ut in limo magno subsideret aestu,
obuia uibranti carpens, grauis aere, lingua
squamosos late torquebat motibus orbes:
tolabant taurae uenientis ad omnia uius.
iam magis atque magis corpus reuolubile uoluens
(attollit nitidis pectus fulgoribus et furt
sublimi ceruice caput, cui crista superne
edita purpureo lucens maculatur amictu
aspectuque micant flammarum lumina toruo)

uerba post carpens omisit F 167 uersus 167-248 paene evanuerunt in S. latis ed. Ald. 1505 motibus
Rom. 1469: mortibus Ad. 168 tollebant
ed. Ald. 1517, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: squallebant Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. aurae (-e
arte Voss.Ha.: aures Onb.: herbae Heyne "probabiliter restitutus": irae Leo uenientis
inueni in Ad., Onb. 169 magnis E resolubile Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum 170 pectus
Rom. 1469: exit Schraderus in editione Friesemanni: effert Friesemannus: ecce olim Ribbeck sed in
ditione lectionem correxit et se scripsit Clausen. 171 sublimae F rapit Bembus 173 micant
metabet sese circum loca, cum uidet ingens
aduersum recubare ducem gregis. acrior instat
lumina diffundens intendere et obuia toruus
saepius arripiens infringere, quod sua quisquam
ad uada uenisset. naturae comparat arma:
arde me, furit stridoribus, intonat ore,
flexibus euersis torquentur corporis orbis,
manant sanguineae per tractus undique guttae,
spiritibus rumpit fauces. cui cuncta parantur,
paruulus hunc prior umoris conterret alumnus

ditione Masuicii 1717 dicens "OBVIA TORVA: quaecumque ipsi toruo obuia erant": torue Onb.
 litterae us paene euauuerunt in imagine codicis Laur.2 177 saeuius Bothe infringere
1469. Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 178 comparat
Rom. 1469: insonant ΓVla. 180 et eversis Heyne "probabiliter restitutas" torquentur Τ: torquentur
FTYVla. Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditiorum: orbis
quo Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. parantur Housman: paranti
1573 in urse.: parente Esc.: parante Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 183 conterret (-er- dll)
Laur.XFr.Vat.Pie.Ad.: exterret Heyne "probabiliter restitutas"
et mortem uitate monet per acumina; namque,
qua diducta genas pandebant lumina gemmis,
hac senioris erat naturae pupula telo
icta leui, cum prosiluit furibundus et illum
obtritum morti misit, cui dissipus omnis
spiritus et cessit sensus. tum torua tenentem
lumina respexit serpentem comminus; inde

impiger, examinis, uix comos mente refugit
et ualidum dextra detraxit ab arbore truncum
(qui casus sociarit opem numenue deorum
prodere sit dubium, ualuit sed uincere talis
horrida squamosi uoluentia membra draconis)

atque reluctantis crebris focdeque petentis

1573 in comm. 192 dextra detraxit ab arbore truncum Γ: dextra truncum detraxit abore (ab ore
Rom. 1469: uel aere V2: detraxit ab arbore dextra truncum FS: extra truncum detraxit ab ore d: dextra
truncum detraxit abora YVla.: dextra truncum detraxit aborno (ab orno ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Ald. 1517,
Bembus) Vat.Ci. ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus 193 qui opem casu numenue deorum sociare
lectionem laudavit Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 legens, "qui, hoc est; quo trunco": quae YVla.
cui Scaliger mentionem fecit in editione Masuicii 1717 sed nihil in editionibus 1573, 1575. (casus... deorum) Scaliger in editione Masuicii 1717 sociarit Ci. ed. Ald. 1517: sociaret
VVoss.Ha.: numerumque A: numerumue Ad. post 193 uersum nanque illi dederitne uiam casusue
deusue inseruerunt aliquot editiones e.g. Bembus, Melanchthon, Petrus Pithoeus [Pierre Pithou]
Epigrammata sed damnauit Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 194 sic ed. Rom. 1469 ualuit Haupt in
1469 seu ed. Rom. 1473 uincere omissit Y talis Sillig: tali VVoss.Ha.: tales
tandem ed. Rom. 1473, ed. Grüninger. 1502 196 petentis
ictibus ossa ferit, cingunt qua tempora cristam;
et quod erat tardus somni languore remoti

nec prius aspiciens timore obcaecaerat artus,
hoc minus implicuit dira formidine mentem.
quam postquam uidit caesium languescere, sedit.

iam quatit et biijus oriens Erebicis equos nox
et piger aurata procedit Vesper ab Oeta,
cum grege compulso pastor duplicantibus umbris
udit et in fessos requiem dare comparat artus.
cuius ut intrauit leuior per corpora somnus
languidaque effuso requierunt membra sopore,
effigies ad eum culicis deuenit et illi
tristis ab euentu cecinit conuicia mortis.
‘quis’ inquit ‘meritis aut quo delatus acerbas
cogor adire uices! tua dum mihi carior ipsa
uita fuit uita, rapior per inania uentis.
tu lentus refoues iucunda membra quiete

C\(^2\): tum X: uersum omisit F 205 in fessos requiem (saepe uerba in fessos scripta sunt in fessos
UYPie.Vla.Ad. Heyne "probabiliter restitutus" (uel C\(^2\)) comparat
comperat U: concuperat Fr. 207 "uel e fuso uel offuso" Wakefield 210 quis inquit Heyne in
ed. Ald. 1517: quis Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: en, quid, ait Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum
C\(^2\)UVla.Ad.Ci. ed. Ald. 1505, Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: meritis, inquit, Scaliger ed. 1573 in
comm.: meriti/ Onb. aut quo Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: ad qu(a)e (unum uerbum in
CFEABTUDlaur.XIFr.Vat.A.: ad quem \(\Gamma\): que Esc.: ad quam YVla.: aut quae Scaliger ed. 1573 in
comm. ad quae probatit Clausen. delatus VFAWTTUVoss.IIHa.Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus: dilatus
Ci. ed. Ald. 1505, Bembus
ereptus taebris e cladibus, at mea manes
uiscura Lethaeas cogunt transmare per undas.
praedia Charonis agor. uiden ut flagrantia taeedis
limina collucent infestis omnia templis!
obuia Tisiphone, serpentibus undique compta,
et flammas et saeua quatit mihi uerbera; pone
Cerberus (ut diris flagrant latratibus ora!),

1475: uideo ed. Ald. 1517: rudi Ad. ut
omiserunt VVla.: ut post uident omisit ed. Nurem. 1492 217 limina (limi Fr.) ATlaur.XFr.Vat.: lumina
Ad.YHae.: tisiophone T: thesephone Esc. 219 it flammas Wakefield pone Haupt in opusculis et in
editione: p(o)em(a)e VCFEAWBTTIEsc.UdVoss.Laur.XIXHae.Fr.Vat.Ad.Ci. ed. Ald. 1517: p(o)ena
Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. latratibus
TUVIPie.Vla. ed. Venet. 1472
anguibus hinc atque hinc horrent cui colla reflexis
sanguineique micant ardorem luminis orbis.

heu, quid ab officio digressa est gratia, cum te
restitui superis leti iam limine ab ipso?
praemia sunt pietatis ubi, pietatis honores?
in uanas abiere uices. et rure recessit

Iustitia et prior illa Fides. instantia uidi
alterius, sine respectu mea fata relinquens.
ad pariles agor euentus: fit poena merenti.
poena sit exitium, modo sit dum grata uloluntas.
existat par officium. feror auia carpens,
auia Cimmerios inter distantia lucos,
quem circa tristes densentur in omnia poenae.
nam uinctus sedet immanis serpentibus Otos,

---

227 iustitia et Schraderus in commentario editionis Heynii: iustitiae (-ciae FTEsc.1Fr.Pie.Vi., -cie VEWT'd
tie
UVoss.Laur.Fr.Vat.Ad.Onb.)

instantia uidi omissit O. uici Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum 229 fit
pena exitium Y: pena sic exitium Vla. sit dum
uers.: fit dum Voss: sit cui I: sit cum Vi. ed. Ald. 1505: si cui Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. 231ipsa per
officium existat feror auia carpens ed. Rom. 1473 232 cimmerios (duo uerba in Π) ΠCi. ed. Rom. 1471:
EAWBTEsc.d{f}Fr.: chymerios ULaur.Ad.: chimerios U{p}Pie.: cimerios I ed. Venet. 1472: cum meries
(unum uerbum in X) XOnb.: chymeros Y: cymerios Pom.Vi. ed. Grüninger. 1502, Bembus: cumarios
Vat.: chumereos Vla. ducentia Wakefield 233 post quem circa etc. uersus 248, 239, 234 legit Scaliger
densantur Ci. Melanchthon 234 uinctus Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, Bembus: uictus
1479: uerbum omissit Ad.
deuinctum maestus procul aspiciens Ephialten,
conati quondam cum sint inscendere mundum;
et Tityos, Latona, tuae memor anxius irae
(implacabilis ira nimit) iacet alitis esca.
terreor, a, tantis insistere, terreor, umbris.
ad Stygias reuocatus aquas uix ultimus amni
exstat nectareas diuum qui prodidit escas,
gutturis arenti reuolutus in omnia sensu.

quid, saxum procul aduero qui monte revoluit,
contempsisse dolor quem numina uinict acerbans
otia quaerentem frustra sibi? ite, puellae,

ite, quibus taedas accendit tristis Erinys.
sicut Hymen praefata dedit conubia mortis [...] 
atque alias alio densas super agrmine turmas,
impietate fera uecedem Colchida matrem,
anxia sollicitis meditantem uulnera natis;
iam Pandonia miserandas prole puellas,
quarum uox Ityn edit Ityn, quo Bistionius rex
orbus epops maeret uolucrese euectus in auras.
at discordantes Cadmeo semine fratres

iam truculenta ferunt infestaque lumina corpus
alter in alterius, iamque auersatus uterque,
impia germani manat quod sanguine dextra.
eheu mutandus numquam labor! auferor ultra
in diuersa magis, distantia nomina cerno;
Elysiam tranandus agor delatus ad undam.
obuia Persephone comites heroidas urget
aduersas praeferre faces. Alcestis ab omni
inuiolata uacat cura, quod saeua mariti
in Chalcedoniis Admeti fata morata est.
ecce Ithaci coniunx semper decus, Icariotis, 265
femineum concepta manet, manet et procul illa
 turba ferox iuuenum telis confixa procorum.
quid, misera Eurydice, tanto maerore recesti,
poenaque respectus et nunc manet Orpheos in te?
audax ille quidem, qui mitem Cerberon umquam
credidit aut ulli Ditis placabile numen,
 nec timuit Phlegethonta furentem ardentibus undis
nec maesta obtenta Ditis ferrugine regna,
defossasque domos ac Tartara nocte cruenta
obsita nec faciles Ditis sine iudice sedes,

iudice, qui uitate post mortem uindicat acta.
sed fortuna ualens audacem fecerat ante.

iam rapidi steterant amnes et turba ferarum

blanda uoce sequax regionem insederat ἀorphei;

iamque imam uiridi radicum mouerat alte

quercus humo [steterant amnes] siluaeque sonorae

sponte sua cantus rapiebant cortice auara.

labentis biuuges etiam per sidera Lunae

pressit equos et tu currentis, menstrua uirgo,

auditura lyram tenuisti nocte relictam.
haec eadem potuit, Ditis, te uincere, coniunx,
Eurydicienque uiro ducendam reddere. non fas,
non erat in uitam diuae exorabili mortis.
illa quidem nimium manes experta seueros
praecptum signabat iter nec rettulit intus
lumina nec diuae corruptit munera lingua;
sed tu crudelis, crudelis tu magis, Orpheu,
oscula cara petens rupisti iussa deorum.
dignus amor uenia, ueniam si Tartara nossent;

---

287 uiro Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: ultro
peccatum meminisse graue est. uos sede piorum,

uos manet heroum contra manus. hic et uterque

Aeadices (Peleus namque et Telamonia uirtus

per secura patris laetantur numina, quorum

conubiiis Venus et Virtus iniunxit honorem:

hunc rapuit serua, ast illum Nereis amauit)

assidet, hic iuuenes, sociatae gloria sortis,

alter † in excisum† referens a naubis ignis

Argolicis Phrygios torua feritate repulsos –
(o quis non referat talis diuortia belli,
quae Troiae uidere uiri uidereque Graii,
Teucrīa cum magno manaret sanguine tellus
et Simois Xanthique liquor, Sigeaque propter
litora cum Troas saeui ducis Hectoris ira
† uidere† in classes inimica mente Pelasgōs

uulnera tela neces ignes inferre paratos?
ipsa iugis namque Ida potens feritatis, ab ipsa
Ida faces altrix cupidis praebebat alumnis,
omnis ut in cineres Rhoeti litoris ora
classibus ambustis flamma lacrimantae daretur.
hinc erat oppositus contra Telaomius heros
obiectoque dabat clipeo certamina, et ills
Hector erat, Troiae summum decus, acer uterque,
fluminibus ueluti fragor †et libet in se...

tegminibus telisque super [Sigeaque praeter]
eriperet reditus, alter Vulcania ferro
uulnera protectus depellere nauibus instat.)
hos erat Aeacides uultu laetatus honores,
Dardaniaeque alter fusio quod sanguine campis
Hector lustrauit deucto corpore Troiam.

ed. Rom. 1471, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: sonat echeris in se Ad.: (a)editur inse (in se ed. Rom. 1469)

rursus acerba fremunt, Paris hunc quod letat et huius
†arma† dolis Ithaci uirtus quod concidit icta.

huic gerit auersos proles Laertia uultus,
et iam Strymonii Rhesi uictorque Dolonis

Pallade iam laetatur ouans rursusque tremescit:

iam Ciconas iamque horret atrox †lestrigone...
illum Scylla rapax canibus succinecta Molossis,
Aetnaeusque Cyclops, illum metuenda Charybdis
pallentesque lacus et squalida Tartara terrent.
hic et Tantaleae generamen prolis Atrides
adsidet, Argiuium lumen, quo flamma regente

atrox (horr- Esc.Onb.) SEsc.IOnb. iamque horret ULaur.²Pie.Ad.: horret ILaur.³Laur.⁴Vi. ed. Rom. 1469:
iamque horrent Y: iamque horret artor Fr.: horrens Pom.: iamiamque horret Ci. _Bembus: uerba post horret
1475: lestrigenas atrox Laur.²Y fortasse atros in Laur.²?: lestrigonen atrox Laur.³: lestrigonas armos
1501 et editiones Ascens.: lestrigones atrox ed. Rom. 1469: l(a)estrigones atros Ci. ed. Ald. 1505,
_Bembus: lestrigione Onb.: omisit d

zanclea V _Wakefield: illum et uerida Γ: illum ranolea Voss.Ha. 332 charbydis IFr.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469:
caryphans SEsc.UIPom. ed. Parm. 1479 334 generamen prolis VHa.Pie.: gener amplis
probis Voss.: gener eacus amplus I ed. Venet. 1475: generiam pliesten Laur.XFr.Vat.: generation prolis Y:
gener aecus amplus Vi. ed. Ald. 1505: generis decus amplus Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, _Bembus: gemini sunt prolis
ed. Rom. 1473 atrides Ci. ed. Ald. 1517, Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: atridae (-e
\text{V A S B T G} \ E s c . \ V o s s . \ I \ L a u r . \ H a . \ P o m . \ V a t . \ P i e . \ A d . \ O n b . )
1501 et editiones Ascens., Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: omisit d 335 quo
UIYVi.Ad. ed. Venet. 1472
Doris Ericthonias prostruat funditus arces.
reddidit, heu, Graiius poenas tibi, Troia, ruenti,

Hellespontiacis obiturus reddidit undis.
illa uices hominum testata est copia quondam,
ne quisquam propriae fortunae munere diues
iret ineuectus caelum super: omne propinquo
frangitur inuidiae telo decus. ibat in altum
uis Argea petens patriam ditataque praeda
arcis Ericthoniae; comes huic erat aura secunda
per placidum cursu pelagus; Nereis ab unda
signa dabat passim flexis super alta carinis,
cum seu caelesti fato seu sideris ortu

342 (aliter Laur.²) decus erapU²Laur.²QXPom.Vi.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469: deus
343 uis argea petens Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum, Wakefield:
uis argoa petens VVoss.Ha.Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in urs.: (aliter Laur.²) uis argo repetens
Ye ) TT 344 erichthonia(e) SCPie.Onb. ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens.: erictoni(a)e VVoss.Ha.: erctioni(ae) F: erychthoniae EU²: erychthoniae (-e AΓEsc.dLaur.)
Y: erichthoniae Fr.: erichtoniae Pom.: erithonei Vat.Ad.: erichtoniae ed. Grüninger. 1502 secunda
Ad. 345 nereides Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm. ab unda Paldamus: ad undas
Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.
undique mutatur caeli nitor, omnia uentis,
omnia turbinibus sunt anxia; iam maris unda
sideribus certat consurgere, iamque superne
corripiere et soles et sidera cuncta minatur
ac ruere in terras caeli fragor. hic modo laetans
copia nunc miseris circumdatur anxia fatis
immoriturque super fluctus et saxa Capherei,
Euboicas aut per cautes Aegaeaeque late
litora, cum Phrygiae passim uaga praeda peremptae
omnis in aequoreo fluitat iam naufraga fluctu.
hic alii resident pariles uirtutis honore
heroes mediisque siti sunt sedibus omnes,
omnes, Roma decus magni quos suscipit orbis.
hic Fabii Deciique, hic est et Horatia uirtus,
hic et fama uetus numquam moritura Camilli,

357 omnis in (ineq- Voss., inaeq- Ha.) aequoreo fluitat (fluit atia Γ) VT'Voss.Ha.: fluctuat omnis in aequoreo
1469, Scaliger in omnibus editionibus: omnis fluctuat in aequoreo F: fluctuant omnis in aequoreo W:
omnis in aequoreo fluctuat S: fluctuat (a)equoreo omnis l ed. Venet. 1472: fluctuat omnis in aequore XFr.:
fluctuat (a)equoreo uunc omnis Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens. iam naufraga fluctu
naufragia fluctu U²: naufraga luctu X: naufraga fluctu Vi. ed. Ascens. 1501 et editiones Ascens.:
inaufraga luctu Ci. Bembus, Scaliger ed. 1573 in comm.: naufraga fluctu Scaliger in editione Masucii
sident CFEAWSBTTEsc.dLaur.XIYFr.Vat.Ad.Onb. 359 omnes V ed. Ald. 1517: omnis
ditiones uersum 369 post 359 inseruit Scaliger. 360 quos
Heinsius in scriptis multorum eruditorum: suscipre W: suscipe T suspicet probauit Clausen. 361 fauii
uerbum in W) CFEAWBTTEsc.Laur.IFr.: morani S: uerba post omnium omisit d camilli ΓCi. Bembus,
Scaliger ed. 1573 in uers.: metelli VVoss.XHa.: melli CEAWBTEsc.Laur.IFr.: beli F: elli S: per euum
uerba post omnium omisit d
Curtius et, mediis quem quondam sedibus Vrbis
deuotum †bellis† consumpsit gurges in unda,
Mucius et prudens ardem corpore passus,
 cui cessit Lydi timefacta potentia regis,
hic Curius clarae socius uirtutis et ille
†Flaminius, deuota dedit qui corpora flammae.
iure igitur talis sedes pietatis honores [...]

364 tellus Wakefield gurges in unda
gurgitis unda Heyne in omnibus operibus 365 mucus FESC.Vi.: mutius
cui cessit lidithime I: legitime cessit (ces- Onb) cui facta (-gg- d ) VAWBESC.dlOnb.: legitime (-gip-Vat., -itt- Vi.) cessit cui (uel V²) fracta V²UVoss.ILaur.XYFr.Pom.Vat.Pie.Vi.Ad.Ci. ed. Rom. 1469:
legitime cessit cui fata C: legitime cui cessit facta FET: legitime et cessit cui facta S: legitime cessit qui fracta Ha. 368 flaminius (-mm- CEAWBTLUXI)
Scipiasquaque duces, quorum deuota triumphis moenia †rapidis† Libycae Carthaginis horrent.

illì laude sua uigeant: ego Ditís opacos cogor adire lacus uidoos, a, lumine Phoebi et uastum Phlegontha pati, quo, maxime Minos, conscelerata pia discernis uinclua sede.

ergò iam causam mortis, iam dicere uitae
uerberibus saeuae cognunt ab iudice Poenae,
cum mihi tu sis causa mali nec conscius adsis;
sed tolerabilibus curis haec immemor audis
*quae tamen ut uanis* dimittes omnia uentis.
digredior numquam reediturus: tu cole fontes
et uiridis nemorum siluas et pascua laetus,

at mea diffusas rapiantur dicta per auras."
dixit et extrema tristis cum uoce recessit.

hunc ubi sollicitum dimisit inertia uitiae

interius grauiter regementem, nec tulit ultra

sensibus infusum culicis de morte dolorem,

quantumcumque sibi uires tribuere seniles

(quis tamen infestum pugnans deuicerat hostem),

riuum propter aquae uiridi sub fronde latentem

conformare locum capit impiger. hunc et in orbem

destinat ac ferri capulum repetiuit in usum,
gramineam ut uiridi foderet de caespite terram. iam memor inceptum peragens sibi cura laborem congestum cumuluit opus, atque aggere multo telluris tumulus formatum creuit in orbem. quem circum lapidem leui de marmore formans conscris, assiduac curac memor. hic et acanthos et rosa purpureum crescent pudibunda ruborem et uiolae omne genus; hic est et Spartica myrtus

atque hyacinthos et hic Cilici crocus editus aruo,
laurus item Phoebi decus ingens, hic rhododaphne
liliaque et roris non auia cura marini
herbaque turis opes priscis imitata Sabina

chrysanthusque hederaeque nitor pallente corymbo
et bocchus Libyae regis memor, hic amaranthus
bumastusque uirens et semper florida pinus;
non illinc narcissus abest, cui gloria formae
igne Cupidineo proprios exarsit in artus;
et, quoscumque nouant uernantia tempora flores,
his tumulus super inseritur. tum fronte locatur
elogium, tacita firmat quod littera uoce:

PARVE CVLEX PECVDVM CVSTOS TIBI TALE MERENTI

FUNERIS OFFICIVM VITAE PRO MVNERE REDDIT.
Chapter Four: Adnotationes Criticae

Anyone who embarks upon a quest to improve a text is bound to feel that his or her contributions are much work in exchange for little glory. Before we begin, a little encouragement from Pierre de Nolhac is in order. He was writing to Léopold Delisle about manuscripts and collectors but the sentiments are universal:

Ces matériaux, il est vrai, pris isolément, sont extrêmement menus et de médiocre importance; c’est de la poussière d’érudition, si on peut dire, et on me reprochera peut-être d’avoir dépensé un long travail et de sérieux efforts de critique à des questions aussi infimes... Un détail insignifiant pour tel lecteur rendra peut-être un jour service à tel autre. Nous n’avons le droit de rien négliger, car, suivant la belle parole d’un de nos humanistes, il n’y a rien de méprisable dans le domaine de la science, οὐδὲν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης φαύλον. (de Nolhac Lettre-Préface x)

1 lusimus... Thalia: scripsimus and camena are glosses which have become part of the text. They need not be given serious consideration as readings.

2 orsum: Our imitator shows himself capable of double-entendre with the clever use of a word which can mean both “web” and “beginning.”

3 haec propter culicis: propter frequently appears in the second position in a sentence and must be construed with haec to mean “on account of this.” Scaliger’s hacpropter is unlikely for it is only found once in Latin in the Menippeae of Varro, fragment 213 verse 3. Plésent attempts to read propter with culicis on the assumption that culicis is accusative plural.96 Leo, whom we must thank for rediscovering docta, shows less acumen here in his choice of culices.97 Birt is surely correct to defend culicis as genitive

---

96 Plésent (1910) 94. Others before Plésent were, doubtless, guilty of this as well but without explanatory notes one cannot be certain how they understood culicis.

97 Friedrich Leo, Culex carmen Vergilio ascriptum (Berolini [Berlin]: apud Weidmannos, 1891) 26.
singular and noticing the poetic plural, he translates *culicis carmina* as "carmen quod est de culice." 98

3 *sint carmina docta*: A hortatory subjunctive is necessary to convince the reader to suspend his or her disbelief concerning the subject matter and is grammatically proper given the presence of other subjunctives. Although this is not meant to be a literary commentary, one cannot help but notice words such as *gracili* and *tenuem* which conjure up images of neoteric poetry and its Greek antecedents. There is no better example of a Catullan expression than *docta*. The task of an editor is made more difficult by the fact that errors in copying Latin usually produce viable words. The question here is whether the poet would choose a word which proved that he was familiar with the works of important authors or whether he would allow his "lofty" introduction to fall flat with *dicta*. As he seems to have taken pains to reflect Virgil’s poetic output in the poem, it does not seem unusual to find other displays of *doctrina*.

4-5 *omnis . . . uoces*: This is the sort of place where editors vainly try to defend the reading found in the majority of the manuscripts although it is by no means certain that it ought to be defended. Like most editors since Leo, I believe that *ducum* should be preserved but it is hardly surprising to see scholars of centuries past following Scaliger’s *ducam*. Open *a*, frequently seen in manuscripts as something approximating *u* could have been interpreted as either *a* or *u*.

It seems to be fairly clear that the poet is explaining to the reader in a convoluted manner that although he is not writing serious verse, his work has similarities to both historical and epic genres. Leo correctly notes that the mosquito will speak in a more

---

elevated style than one would expect from a humble creature. "ut heroes deique loquetur
culex . . . culex queritur: praemia sunt pietatis, ubi, pietatis honores? locutione utitur qua
Venus Vergiliana (I, 253) hic pietatis honos?" Its words are worthy of Dido or Medea
as they recount the role they played in saving their former lovers.

In this difficult passage, the most helpful advice is that of Buecheler who explains
the lines as follows, "propter lusum de culice doctum carmen proponam quod concinat
ordine et uocibus cum historiis et ἔπειτα λου."

Buecheler's article shows that consonent
must be supplied in order for uoces to have a verb and that ordo and uoces must be taken
with both historiae and notitiaque ducum.

Translate: "On account of this, (i.e. the fact that I have not taken my task of
writing seriously) let there be learned poetry about a mosquito and let the layout and
language be entirely consistent with historical and epic genres (but) in a light-hearted
vein."

5 uoces. licet inuidus adsit.: I place a period after uoces in order to emphasize the poet's
challenge to his critics. The clipped licet sentence implies "for all I care." It is not
uncommon to see licet at the start of a sentence. Calpurnius Siculus provides this
example and, indeed, several others:

uos populi gaudete mei: licet omne uagetur
securo custode pecus nocturnaque pastor
claudere fraxinea nolit praesaepia crate,
non tamen insidias praedator ouilibus uillas
afferet aut laxis abiget iumenta capistris.
(Calpurnius Siculus Eclogues 1.37-41)

99 Leo 27.

100 Franz Buecheler, "Coniectanea," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie 45
(1890): 325.
7 feratur: The decision to read *feratur* hinges on the previous decision to have the poet issue a challenge to potential critics. My choice enjoys some favour with twentieth-century editors (Plévent, Herrmann, Vassalini) and perhaps would be more popular today if others had been acquainted with a wide range of late manuscripts. It is best to follow Plévent who states, "*feratur* est la leçon traditionnelle. Elle me paraît moins bonne: le poète ne se contente pas de prévoir la confusion de ses ennemis, il les maudit."  

9 securus: This word has caused much speculation among editors. No one is quite certain of the cause of "Virgil's" concern. Is it war or too much work? Heyne is probably correct to assume that *fructus* means "*fructus ingenii." There is no evidence that *securus* ought to be replaced with *matusos* following the recommendation of Nicolaas Heinsius. Sillig advises us to leave matters alone saying, "quibus rebus poeta illo tempore . . . uexatus fuerit, nos nunc latet."  

Transfer the epithet slightly and translate: "when the seasons find me free from care and deliver their bounty to me."

10 poliantur: Our poet once again uses a word with Catullan associations. Catullus literally and figuratively polished up poems which he claimed were only *nugae*. This is false modesty for we know that he had hopes of immortality for them.

Cui dono lepidum nouum libellum  
arido modo pumice expolitum?  
Corneli, tibi: namque tu solebas  
meas esse aliquid putare nugas

---


102 Plévent (1910) 95.

103 Heyne (1793) 22.

104 Heyne-Sillig 48.
The author of the *Culex* claims to be interested in writing serious poetry but not at the present time. Refusal to write epic is a common theme among Latin poets. Neoteric poets abhor the thought of a long-winded epic on the grounds that it violates their stylistic beliefs and prefer epyllion. Love poets swear that it is against their nature as they are lovers not fighters. Clever versifiers turn the refusal into a manifesto on how poetry ought to be written or compliment the ruler of the day by promising him an *Aeneid*-like account of his exploits at some future date. In the latter case, they are usually not to be believed for they are simply exploring the literary possibilities of the *recusatio*.

13 *recinente*: Ernout and Meillet demonstrate that *cano* changes to *cino* in compound forms which Latin authors invent as they struggle to find words for Greek concepts. See A. Ernout and A. Meillet, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine* (Paris: Éditions Klincksieck, 1994) 93. This problem is illustrated by a passage of Lucretius:

```
Nec me animi fallit Graiorum obscura reperta
dificile inlustrare Latinis uersibus esse,
multa nouis uerbis praeertim cum sit agendum
propter egestatem linguae et rerum nouitatem.
(Lucretius *De rerum natura* 1.136-139)
```

The reading of the OCT must stand.

13 *educat*: It is common in a long list to avoid repetition of phrases such as “the people from town X.” This is frequently replaced by something like “the men who drink river Y” or “the youths whom town Z, mother of sheep, nourishes.” Note this passage of Virgil:
In our poem, Apollo is not being brought up by the town, he is simply inhabiting it.

14 Arna: Taubmann defends alma saying, “elegantur subintelligitur urbs.” If the poet has intentionally omitted the town’s name, he surely does not deserve to have this deviation from normal style recorded as a pattern for others to follow but he is not at fault here. The scribe must be blamed for changing an unfamiliar place name to a recognizable word. We are looking for a place in Lycia (southern Asia Minor) as that is the home of the Xanthus river and the Chimaera mountain. Haupt discovered in his reading of the works of Stephen of Byzantium that “Ἀρνα, πόλις Λυκίας.” He first published this conjecture in 1858 and it became part of his edition of 1873. Much of the confusion in this line arises from the fact that Xanthus is also the name of a town. Sillig’s conjecture acta “sea-shore” is unnecessary.

15 Asteriae: Asteria is another name for Delos. Pliny the Elder reports this at 4.66.8 of his Naturalis historia.

Our nearly-forgotten Canon. Class. Lat. 54 makes a sudden appearance in this line and must be mentioned as it disagrees with Oporin’s edition of 1544. The manuscript has astrigeri while astrigerum is found in the printed book. Both are wrong.

---

105 Taubmann 37.

106 Moritz Haupt, Opuscula Vol. III Part 1 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1967) 64; Moritz Haupt, Opera P. Vergilii Maronis (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: apud S. Hirzelium, 1873). Haupt’s edition is exceedingly hard to find and I am grateful to the staff of DBI-Link for arranging photocopies for me.

107 Heyne-Sillig 27.

21 agrestum . . . tenentis: It is clear how this line turned into a jumble of curas and securas. First of all, there were two places in the sentence which could be misunderstood as reading secura. fetura caused the common f/s and c/t errors of recognition while sit cura sounded like secura.

23 antra: Heyne must be thinking of Horace when he suggests antra for there is a poem among the *Odes* in which Horace is guided by Bacchus through groves and caves. Horace even provides two different words for “cave” one of which Heyne seizes upon.

Quo me, Bacche, rapis tui
plenum? quae nemora aut quos agor in specus
uelox mente noua? quibus
antris egregii Caesaris audiar
aeternum meditans decus
stella inserte et consilio iouis?
(Horace *Carmina* 3.25.1-6)

Pales is concerned with agriculture and earthly matters. “Stars” are beyond her sphere of influence.

24 at: at seems appropriate here as the poet has finished with the description of his divine mentor and resumed praises of his human, but hardly ordinary, patron. One can make an argument that the poet would continue the *et tu* pattern but it seems likely that along with Professor Clausen’s insertion of a new paragraph should come an indication that the poet has shifted from several addressees who may be taken together in Roman prayer formula to one who must receive separate and special treatment.

Bembo shows a great deal of sense when he proposes simple changes. He and others such as Scaliger, Heinsius and Heyne damage their own credibility when they
attempt conjectures which either improve the poem to such an extent that it becomes a
different work or suggest words which cannot be justified by the available space or the
shape of the letters in the manuscripts. Their reasons for doing this are obvious. If they
believe that Virgil was the author of the poem at either a young, or worse, a mature age,
they are unlikely to ascribe language to him which is manifestly unworthy of him. Their
facility with Latin and the fact that they are all are poets in their own right occasionally
blinds them to the reality that even in ancient times authors could be guilty of awkward
phrasing. One cannot restore something to its former glory if it was of dubious quality to
begin with.

24 cui . . . chartis: Do not take *meritis* with *chartis*. Translate: “But you, because of
whose merits my confidence in my writing grows.”

35-36 mollia . . . gaudet: In the introduction, a possible imitation of the *Culex* by
Calpurnius Siculus came to light and we lamented the lack of information concerning his
dates of birth and death for it would have assisted us in dating our poem. Calpurnius
tantalizes us with another tidbit in these lines. Is the reading from *Eclogue* 4 verse 152
“olor quam tereti decurrent carmina uersu” a borrowing or a simple coincidence?
Heinsius knew that *pede currere* contained the true word, some form of *decurrere*, but is
a participle really necessary? There is no need to connect 35 and 36 just because the
supposed adjective *apta* does not have a noun. Latin gives several examples where *apta*
is used as a substantive. Pomponius Mela *De chorographia* 3.19.6-7 offers “itaque cum
mortuis cremant ac defodiunt apta uuentibus” and Tacitus *Annales* 3.31.16-17 has
“Drusus apta temperandis animis disseruit.” The switch from *decurrere* (future) to *gaudet*
(present) is not uncharacteristic of this poet. If one absolutely must have a connective,
Ribbeck's *uersu et* is worth a look but it produces an extremely unpleasant effect as he readily admits.

Translate: "Poems will flow down smoothly but in restrained verse.

It is pleasant to play at things which are suited to their own strength with Phoebus as teacher."

37 *memorabilis*: This word is awkward but there is no evidence that it is not what the author intended. This is glory that is fit to be recorded. The poet hopes that Octavian will be on the lips of men forever.

37 *constet*: Heyne is correct to see that the *r* of *certet* is really hiding the letter *s* but there is no reason why the *c* must also be changed. We are looking for a verb which means "let *x* continue" or "let *x* exist" and we find it in *constet*. I arrived at *constet* without consulting Wagenvoort's article but the credit for the conjecture must be given to him.\(^{108}\)

44 *fugabat*: This imperfect verb continues the pattern begun by *penetrabat* and *quatiebat*.

47 *uuida*: Sickly-yellow grass is neither a pretty picture nor very appetizing. An editor is spoiled here by the number of conjectures offered by his or her predecessors. In this sort of case, I find it helpful to write out the offending word in my worst handwriting in an attempt to see how some letters could have turned into others. If one does this, one comes to *uuida* without much difficulty as Scaliger did in his commentary.

48 *usgae*: I am allowing *usgae* to stand but, like Wakefield, I fear that *usgae* with the implied *sunt* has replaced an actual verb. One can make a case for *paronomasia* because

very soon we are faced with carpuntur . . . carpente but here it is difficult to decide
whether uagae . . . uagantes is the fault of an inept poet or an inept scribe.

49 celebres e: The animals are not stampeding while they eat their breakfast! They are
walking very slowly crowded together in groups and grazing as they go. Wakefield steers
us in the right direction yet again. Compare this passage from Cicero:

    usque ad hoc tempus Syracusani
    festos dies anniuersarios agunt celeberrimo uirorum mulie-
    rumque conuentu.
    (Cicero In Verrem 2.4.107.12-14)

50 tondabant: The switch from present to imperfect is jarring but its frequency shows us
that it is intentional unlike the fugarat which we changed to fugabat. This odd style
works well in story-telling. I have tried to invent a similar example in colloquial English
to illustrate the shift in tenses. The tenses are not quite parallel to the ones in the Culex.
One young boy recounts a story of a fight with the neighbourhood bully to his friend:

"I had a fight with John. He tried to trip me as I was walking down the stairs."

"So what do you do?"

"I get mad. I punch him and I kick him. Then he got scared and went home."

53 labrusca: As previously stated in the introduction, Nonius Marcellus realized that the
neuter plural form labrusca found in the Culex was odd and called the reader’s attention
to the fact that it was normally feminine.

56 sentes: The Oxford Latin Dictionary observes that the word sentes is usually
masculine but is feminine at Culex 56 and Nux 113. See P. G. W. Glare, Oxford Latin

57 imminet . . . undam: If it is proper to speak about the quality of a manuscript’s errors,
then Γ must win the prize for its ability to write gibberish which reveals the true word or
at least gives a clue as to what the author intended. At line 366, its *lidithime* turns into *Lydi timefacta* while the other manuscripts opt for the unimaginative *legitime*. In line 57, I suspect that *intuici* is not hiding any declension of *riuus* or any form of *ripa*. The goat’s position on a bank near a stream is obvious and, thus, some words can be omitted without any damage to the sense. *imminet intuitu* would literally mean “peers down upon x with its gaze.” The translation needs improvement but is adequate for the moment. After that, we are in treacherous waters. Some genitive singular participle ending in *-stantis* is required and then, perhaps, the dative *umbrae*. After *illa*, I suggest *imminet intuitu prostantis imaginis umbrae*.

Lucretius uses *prostare* in the sense of “projecting” at *De rerum natura* 2.428 “*angellis . . . prostantibus.*” We use Lucretius again to assist us in translating *prostantis imaginis umbrae*. If Lucretius writes “pavements of streets” in his poetry, we understand him to mean “paved streets.” Here we could say “shadow of a projecting reflection” but “shadowy projecting reflection” is more elegant. The verse now translates as “while a third peers downward intently at the shadowy projecting reflection.” In a line such as this where one cannot even determine the extent of the corruption, there is little hope of a solution.

**58 non:** Remember to use *non* with both *fastidiat* and *probet*.

**62 lota:** For the choice of *lota* instead of *lauta*, see Quicherat who observes, “*lautus s’est spécialisé dans le sens de élécat, distigué, par suite riche, honorable.*” Le sens de *baigné, lavé* est a peine attéste et ne dépasse pas Térence . . . *lotus* a gardé le sens de *lavé, baigné.*”

---

109 Quicherat 345.
66 gratum: *gratum* is rather flat as an adjective and *graium* beckons but before we change it, we must also consider the author’s fondness for forms of *gratus*. He uses them at lines 41, 76, 94 and 230.

67 referunt: It is logical to have *referunt* as the author is fairly consistent in his usage of the present tense in this section. Only *fuerint* breaks the pattern and it is not a reading to be trusted.

72 recinente: See note for verse 13.

81 agnouit: *agnouit* is a gnomic perfect. “The gnomic perfect strictly refers to past time; but its use implies that something which never did happen in any known case never does happen, and never will.” See J. H. Allen and James Greenough, *Allen and Greenough’s Latin Grammar* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1903) 299.

83-84 dum . . . ornem . . . transcendat: The subjunctive represents the imaginary soldier’s wishes or intentions. There is no argument to be made for *transcendit* and Salvatore, realizing this, has not reprinted the indicative in his new 1997 edition.

87 panchaia: Scan as long-short-short. In Quicherat’s day, *panchaica* was accepted as the reading at Ovid *Metamorphoses* 10.309 but has since been disallowed and does not appear as a variant in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. See Quicherat 837-838 and *Oxford Latin Dictionary* 1288.

89 uoluptas.: A period must be placed after *uoluptas* if one accepts my theory that verse 90 is the start of a new thought and should not be connected to verse 89 with a comma.

90 liber a supplicibus curis: Why does *uoluptas* require a second adjective? If an editor decides to leave *libera* untouched, he or she must answer that question. The adjective
describes the goatherd and *pastor* is easily understood from the narrative. *liber* is occasionally followed by *a/ab* and the ablative as Livy shows:

se ipsam plebem et commoda morari sua. liberam urbe
ac forum a creditoribus, liberos agros ab inustis possessori-
bus extemplo, si uelit, habere posse.
(Livy *Ab urbe condita* 6.39.9.1-10.1)

In Virgil, gifts and prayers humbly beseech Juno so it is not inconceivable that worries should beg to be heard in a nagging manner.

Iunoni cane uota libens dominamque potentem
supplcibus supera donis: sic denique uictor
Trinacria finis Italos mittere relicta.
(Virgil *Aeneid* 3.438-440)

surge age, nate dea, primisque cadentibus astris
Iunoni fer rite preces, iramque minasque
supplcibus supera uotis. mihi uictor honorem
persolues. ego sum pleno quem flumine cernis
stringentem ripas et pinguia culta secantem,
caeruleus Thybris, caelo gratissimus amnis.
(Virgil *Aeneid* 8.59-64)

I recognize that there are several places in this line where an error could have crept in. Given that fact, it seems best to offer a conjecture which preserves as many of the original letters as possible. *liber a* became *libera* through improper word division. *supplcibus curis*, if correct, is unusual and could have been changed to *simplicibus*. One cannot say that of Wakefield’s *uindicibus*.

90 *huic*: The author of the *Culex* frequently looks to Catullus for inspiration and employs *imminere* and the dative in a manner that is similar to a construction found in poem 61 where a bridegroom is staring intently at his new wife:

aspipe, intus ut accubans
uiir tuus Tyrri in toro
totus immineat tibi.
(Catullus *Carmina* 61.164-166)
91 derigit: derigit appeared to be an alternative spelling and it seemed appropriate to change it to the more common dirigit but this passage in the Oxford Latin Dictionary prevented such a course of action: "The earlier form appears to be der-, and no certain example of dir- occurs in inscriptions before the 4th century A.D. MSS. and add. vary greatly in their practice."\(^{110}\)

92 quolibet ... abundet: This chiastic construction confused the scribes of excerpts e, r, a, p and Tr. who felt the need to add et.

93 liget: It is odd to use the verb ligare when speaking of the act of falling asleep and there are no examples in Latin. Instead, one generally sees a form of dare, tradere or leuare. Read leuet along with Nicolaas Heinsius and the excerpts e, r, a, p and Tr.

95 frondis: Hamadryads are wood-nymphs. They have nothing to do with springs. Read frondis following Nicolaas Heinsius. gratissima frondis translates as "most pleasant for its foliage" and is a genitive of specification.

96 sibi: Plézent explains, "sibi se rattache à quisque (chaque pâtre pour son compte cherche à rivaliser avec le poète d'Ascra)."\(^{111}\)

103 qua: This word is less desirable than some of the manuscript readings and conjectures but, nevertheless, is probably a reminiscence of Aeneid 7.100-101 "qua sol utrumque recurrens / aspicit Oceanum." The Younger Seneca also uses the expression utrumque Oceanum at verse 1839 of his Hercules Oetaeus.

105 repetebant: Intransitive usage of this verb is rare but also occurs at Aeneid 7.241 with the words "huc repetit."

\(^{110}\) Oxford Latin Dictionary 547.

\(^{111}\) Plézent (1910) 122.
108-109 umbras . . . et: Any decision regarding lines 108-109 requires us to supply a
direct object pecudes from 108. Although the omission is hardly glaring, it would seem
less strange if umbras were joined to the following verse. The poet is already guilty of a
run-on sentence from 109-114. Let us further incriminate him by having him start his
rambling train of thought one verse earlier.

112 infandas scelerata manus: The "Greek Accusative" is a construction much loved by
Virgil and, no doubt, very familiar to his imitators.

117 Oeagrius: Orpheus would appear to be the logical choice but A. E. Housman has
shown in his edition of Manilius' Astronomicon that Orpheus must not be scanned in
three syllables.112 A patronymic or a noun formed from a place name is in order. Heinsius
rightly looked to Virgil for assistance and found Oeagrius Hebrus at Georgics 4.524.
This word was then corrupted to some form of horridus.

118 canendo: As it stands, this verse makes no sense. The river is behaving as it usually
does in the story but the woods are rewriting the myth. Scaliger noticed this and his
comments are printed in my apparatus. Efforts have been made to change ripis but that is
not where the problem lies. The woods need a participle to express what they are doing
and canendo is the obstacle in our path. I suspect that it is a gloss which has wormed its
way into the text as an explanation of tenuit. The verse only works if Orpheus is "holding
the attention" of the inanimate objects as he can hardly be said to be holding x motionless
and holding y in motion. We are looking for something along the lines of Eclogues 3.36
siluasque sequentis.

112 A. E. Housman, Marcus Manilius: Astronomicon, Volume I (Hildesheim:
Georg Olms Verlag, 1972) 33.
119-120 quantum . . . uultu: Supply a feminine plural subject like "maidens" from laetae and a third person plural form of temuit. Revisit the quantum of line 117 and translate: "The son of Oeagrus did not hold . . . as much as the maidens held." Treat chorea as ablative "with their dancing." laetae tuo uultu must be "happy at the sight of your face" but is rarely used in that sense. The only example readily available is from Lucan's Bellum Civile 6.158-159 where he writes, "peterem felicior umbras Caesaris in uoltu."

122 quis: The author of the Culex repeatedly uses quis for quibus. See also verses 145, 151, 210 and 389.

127 ignipedum: insigni as an adjective for Helios' chariot or horses is about as lackluster as the poet's usual favourite, gratus. At least here the flat adjective is the scribe's fault, the product of improper word division. ignipedum, as Heinsius discovered, is a stock epithet for horses and is found at Ovid Metamorphoses 2.392 and Statius Thebaid 1.27.

132 perfide: The accuracy of this word is guaranteed by the stylistic habits of the poet at 125 where impia at the start of the line picks up impia at the end of the preceding line. This occurs again at 134-135 with quercus . . . quercus.

140 ilicis . . . cupressus: This conjecture is a reworking of ideas of other scholars but is somewhat original in the manner in which it attempts to restore the symmetry of the line. The manuscripts all read et laeta and I believe the scribes at least as far as the et. The copyists saw a word which confused them and which they promptly changed to laeta. 140 and 141 once contained et . . . et and que . . . que perhaps in imitation of the Greek love of balanced composition. If we begin with these ideas in mind, we must reject nec. Rearrange the first half of the sentence in such a way that lethaea will scan properly in
the remaining available space. Not only do we now have balance but also an adjective which the poet is known to favour as he uses it in verse 215.

140 *species:* Why was *species* included in this line? The "appearance of ilex" is ilex as Heyne observes when he says, "*ilicis species pro periphrasi habendum, pro ilice simpliciter dicta." A. E. Housman wrote the words "Head of a traveller" as a parody of this very type of overblown language but based on Greek tragedy rather than Latin epyllion.

140 *cupressus:* Heyne translates this as a genitive but other scholars do not share his opinion.

141 *fagus:* The poet treats this tree in the same fashion as *platanus* and has *fagus* –*ūs*, nominative plural feminine. Varro *De gente populi Romani* 1.130 "fagus quas φηγοῦς Graeci uocant" is the only other occurrence of the word in the fourth declension.

151-152 *hac . . . fuet:* It is possible to translate the line as it stands if one allows a poetic usage of *referunt*. The verb is given the meaning "to reply" in the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* on page 1594 under entry 12d. In Anna's conversation with Dido at *Aeneid* 4.31, Virgil writes, "Anna referit." In our line, the voices of the mud-bathing creatures reply.

168 *taurae:* Of the available choices, Leo's *irae* is the most likely to be correct. I had hoped to make something out of manuscript Fr.'s *aures*, thinking that it would be in character for the snake to use all its senses but the result was either impossible scansion

---

113 Heyne (1793) 41.

114 "Fragment of a Greek Tragedy" is available in two versions. Most readers will only be familiar with the revised work. The website of Cambridge Classics offers the first attempt at [http://www.classics.cam.ac.uk/Faculty/housman.html](http://www.classics.cam.ac.uk/Faculty/housman.html) and a link to the final version at [http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/texts/housman.html](http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/jod/texts/housman.html).
or a fundamentally different verb. Scaliger and the 1517 Aldine recognized this difficulty but their improvements are not convincing to a student of palaeography.

170 se: The common s/f confusion has befallen scribes yet again and the decision rests between various forms of ferre. The 1517 Aldine offers et fert which fits the context and allows us to keep the connective. Frieseman places a colon and writes effert. Ribbeck ignores the shape of the letters with his ecce and joins Schrader's exit at the far right of the apparatus entry. For the record, any statement by Schrader's admirer Frieseman must be treated with the utmost caution as he routinely credits the conjectures of Heinsius and others to Schrader.

197 cristam: At verse 171 the snake is described as having a crest. Follow the majority and read cristam. Learned arguments about the intricacies of snake anatomy are useless here.

199 nec prius...artus: I cannot accept Leo's explanation that aspiciens timor is equivalent to "timor aspiciendo factus, aspicientis." The goatherd is the subject of obcaecauerat. timor cannot also be a subject unless we place it in parentheses as some have attempted. We want Sillig's negative nec with the excellent prius and the participle aspiciens. These words describe the goatherd. Has timor lost its e? Is there a trace of it in VVoss.Ha.'s excecauerat? Was it once parallel to formidine in the next line? It is possible.

Translate: "and he had not blinded his limbs with fear by gazing at <it> beforehand."

---

115 Leo 68.
210 aut quo: A skillful imitator would be familiar with Virgil’s habit of having his characters ask one or more questions followed by one beginning with aut. Consider these passages:

    ipsum autem sumptis Piamum iuuenalibus armis
    ut uidit, 'quae mens tam dira, miserrime coniunx,
    impulit his cingi telis? aut quo ruis?' inquit.
    (Virgil Aeneid 2.518-520)

    'nate, quis indomitas tantus dolor excitat iras?
    quid furis? aut quonam nostri tibi cura recessit?'
    (Virgil Aeneid 2.594-595)

216 uidem ut: The n, a shortened form of –ne before vowels and even consonants does not have to be part of a question. Here it is an indignant exclamation from an angry insect as it is being hurried along unable to properly finish its words.

222 micant ardorem: The internal accusative caused discomfort among the scribes and led some to opt for the unmetrical ardore.


244 acerbans: The meaning “embittering” is only found in this verse.

259 nomina: This word is the most obvious choice as the mosquito is about to recite a list of those who have become proverbial either for vice or virtue. The poet has read his Homer as well as the sixth book of the Aeneid and knows what is expected. He dusts off these well-worn characters but does not give them a new coat of paint. While Virgil reworks old material and uses the Underworld scene to foreshadow Rome’s coming glory, there is no originality or optimism in its counterpart in the Culex.

\(^{116}\) Heyne (1793) 54.
264 in Chalcedoniiis: Canon. Class. Lat. 54 which seemed so promising because of its association with Pomponio Leto fails us once again. On folio 9v it does provide copious commentary but for calcedoniiis not chalcodoniiis.

291 munera: The manuscripts exhibit the same variety of readings whenever there is a word of three syllables. At verses 217 and 259 an editor must choose between limina, lumina, nomina, numina, nomine, flumina and limine. In 291, the author may have in mind the words munere diuæ from Aeneid 6.637 where they are used in a different context. Ironically, the word limine appears in 6.636 further complicating matters. munera is better than limina in terms of the plot of the Orpheus and Eurydice myth as it was hardly common for mortals to be allowed to return to the world of the living after death. limina is also attested by untrustworthy manuscripts which are suspiciously similar to printed books.

300 serua, ast: This is yet another example of the tendency to confuse s and f. The slave in question is Laomedon’s daughter Hesione whom Hercules rescued from the sea monster and gave to Telamon as a prize. We must decide whether to read seruata with Housman or serua with Bembo. Is it more important that she was saved or that she was a slave? Ovid made much out of Greek leaders who were in love with their slaves:

Quid, quod in ancilla siquis delinquere possit,  
illem ego contendi mente carere bona?  
Thessalus ancillae facie Briseidos arsit,  
servam Mycenaeo Phoebas amata duci.  
(Ovid Amores 2.8.9-12)

117 A. E. Housman (1902) 344.
Who can forget the way in which he constantly exploited the theme of playing slave to one’s slave? With the amount of literature that has accumulated comparing the Culex to Ovid, one would be ill-advised to bet against Bembo and Rome’s desultor amoris.

324 Hector: A quick scan of Latin literature reveals that one is more likely to see forms of the proper name Hector rather than adjectives based on that name. The ratio is approximately 2:1. For a similar idea with lustravit corpore, compare Ovid Ibis 333-334 “Vel qui, quae fuerat tutatus moenia saepe, / Corpore lustravit non diuturna suo.”

360 suscipit: There is no reason to read suspectit with Heinsius. The verse as it stands makes perfect sense in either of two possible ways. Heyne states, “suscipit uel pro suscepit, quorum parens fuit Roma, uel pro tenet, habet.”

380 quae tamen ut uanis: We are aiming to preserve the original sentence structure as much as possible with our conjecture while at the same time looking for any words which are recognizable from other authors. uanis uentis is a proverbial expression seen at Catullus 64.111. While Melanchthon’s offering is the most pleasant to translate, it does not address the question of the ut which, unfortunately, appears to have been a fixture in the original. Follow Bembo but with some hesitation.

407 pinus: Courtney has found new evidence to support pinus. He reports, “This is usually emended to tinus for two reasons: (1) a pine is too large for the gnat’s grave-enclosure; not very convincing, especially when one looks at some of the other things planted by the shepherd. (2) semper florida does not suit it.” He now advises as follows:

\[\text{\textsuperscript{118} Heyne (1793) 68-69.}\]
“See however Paul. Nol. carm, 21.298 *pinus enim semper florente cacumine perstans.*”

We can now lay the issue of *pinus* to rest along with the *culex.*

---

Conclusion

This thesis began with a history of the text of the *Culex* and the scholars who chose this poem among so many others as the arena in which to display their considerable talents. Research on that section, while time-consuming and not instantly rewarding, later proved to have been a good investment as it revealed not only possible solutions for textual problems but also revealed much about the development of textual criticism.

The catalogue of manuscripts was an opportunity to build on the discoveries of the past and the number of manuscripts will yet reach one hundred. This is an area where there is ample room for exploration. Libraries have not yielded up their last *Culex* manuscripts and fragments will, no doubt, continue to be found in the middle of the most unlikely texts.

Along with the manuscripts, one must not forget the incunabula. Professor Grant’s article on Pietro Bembo quotes from incunabula in the Rylands Library which take our text in new directions through their variant readings. Perhaps these books will help us to determine the parentage of late *Culex* manuscripts which were not discussed in this study or whose descent remains uncertain.

More work needs to be done to correct improperly assigned conjectures. This is an extremely labour-intensive process which requires the effort of more than one scholar. With the promised assistance of a professor at Leiden’s Rijksuniversiteit, I shall continue to trace the contribution of Nicolaas Heinsius to *Culex* scholarship through the elusive seventeenth-century scholar’s manuscripts and correspondence.

The apparatus criticus was intended as a retrospective of *Culex* editions with a particular emphasis on rare works and, for that reason, only covered the most important
articles from scholarly journals. I have created a database which matches all accessible 
Culex scholarship to the individual lines of the poem. When time permits, I shall 
incorporate this into the apparatus criticus and present a comprehensive bibliography.

Technology will play a large role in the study of this text and many others. The 
learning process involved with the Adain and Classical Text Editor programs is well 
worth the effort. The Culex will be preserved in digitization projects, online manuscript 
catalogues, electronic text archives and web pages devoted to Virgil. Scholars of the 
current generation will be judged not only on our skills as palaeographers and textual 
critics but also by our ability to share what we have learned with our colleagues
throughout the world and by our success in promoting interest in the subject matter 
among current and prospective students. This will be our contribution to the classical 
tradition.

paruus sed similis regibus es Culex.
quod te non genuit Vergilius Maro,
nequaquam tamen est dedecori tibi,
nam gaudens coluit docta puella te.
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